

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY),
WINCHES FARM,
395, HATHFIELD ROAD, 7th July.
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

7th July, 1950

13 JUL 1950

The Official Organ of

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

CONTENTS :

Title Page ; Thanks to U.N.E.S.C.O. ; Composition of Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 ; Foreword by the Secretary-General to the Congress ; Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the Official Publication of the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature and of the Reports submitted to the Congress ; Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the Class and Ordinal Names used in the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature ; Table of Contents	Page
Part 1. <i>The Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in July 1948</i> : Minutes of the First Meeting and first instalment of the Minutes of the Second Meeting	TP.—xxi Half-Title, (1)-62

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

VOLUME 5

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948.

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

(All rights reserved)

Printed in Great Britain
by METCHIM & SON, LTD.,
at their Press at 8, Princes St.,
Westminster, London, S.W.1.

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on behalf
of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

have great pleasure

in

expressing their grateful thanks

to the

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANISATION

— U.N.E.S.C.O. —

for the financial assistance

afforded

towards the cost of producing

the present volume

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, Paris, JULY 1948

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

The following members of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology attended meetings of the Section on Nomenclature :—

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)

M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)	Dr. Edward ¹ Hindle (United Kingdom)
M. Belloc (France)	M. Denis Jacques (France)
Senor E. Beltrán (Mexico)	Professor R. Jeannel (France)
M. H. Berthet (France)	Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)	Professor A. R. Jorge (Portugal)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)	Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)	Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy)	Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)	Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)	Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Professor Ernest N. Cory (U.S.A.)	Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)	Dr. S. di Toledo Piza (Brazil)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)	Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)	M. G. Ranson (France)
Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)	Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)	Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France)	M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)
Professor A. Ghigi (Italy)	Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)	Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Dr. H. A. F. Gohar (Egypt)	Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)	Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)	Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)
Professor W. P. Hayes (U.S.A.)	Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

The following also attended meetings of the Section:

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

FOREWORD

by the

SECRETARY-GENERAL

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

Antérieurement, les comptes-rendus des séances de la Section de Nomenclature des Congrès de Zoologie étaient inclus dans les Comptes-rendus de ces Congrès. Il n'a pas été possible de faire de même lors du Congrès de Paris en 1948 : les séances de la Section, très bien remplies, ont fait l'objet de Comptes-rendus particulièrement volumineux dont la rédaction demandait beaucoup de temps et dont la publication entraînait à de grandes dépenses. De sorte que le Bureau du Congrès de Zoologie a dû demander à Mr. Francis Hemming de bien vouloir réserver la publication de ces Comptes-rendus pour le " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature".

A cette occasion, je suis heureux d'exprimer à Mr. Hemming mes félicitations pour le très gros travail de préparation qu'il a effectué avant le Congrès, pour la grande activité de la Section de Nomenclature déployée pendant le Congrès et pour l'importance des résultats obtenus et des décisions prises.

Le Secrétaire Général du Congrès de Zoologie de 1948

E. FISCHER-PIETTE,

Professeur au Museum.

XIIIe Congrès International de Zoologie,
Secrétariat Général : 55, Rue de Buffon,
Paris Ve.

le 17 janvier, 1950.

**OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE SECTION
ON NOMENCLATURE, THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS
OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948, AND OF THE REPORTS SUB-
MITTED THEREBY FOR APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS IN
PLENARY SESSION**

Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature

The proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in July 1948 differ from those at all previous Congresses by reason of the wide area covered by the work performed and the very large number of the decisions taken. The Section held no less than six meetings, each meeting being held concurrently with a meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. At these meetings a very large number of conclusions was reached in regard to the amendment, clarification and amplification of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, on which it was unanimously agreed that recommendations should be submitted to the Congress for approval in Plenary Session. In addition, the Section, in agreement with the Commission, formulated a long series of recommendations relating to the reform of the composition and procedure of the Commission and matters related thereto. Finally, the Section participated in discussions in the Commission in regard to a large number of individual questions of zoological nomenclature and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission in these cases. In another respect also, the proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature in Paris differed from those of meetings of the Section at previous Congresses, for at Paris, for the first time, the Section, as also the Commission, were supplied with an extensive series of documents to assist them in the consideration of the large number of important and complex issues which it was their duty to consider.

2. In these circumstances it was inevitable that the Report prepared by the Commission and submitted to the Congress by the Section, on its own behalf and on that of the Commission should be far more comprehensive and detailed than any Report similarly submitted to a previous Congress. In addition to the main Report reciting the principal developments which had occurred since the last previous Congress, the Congress of Lisbon of 1935, and dealing with the work performed during the Paris Congress, two further Reports were submitted to that Congress by the Section on Nomenclature. The first of these Reports, prepared by the Secretary to the Commission, contained a detailed account of the numerous and complex administrative and financial problems which had arisen in the administration of the affairs of the Commission during the long period of thirteen years which had elapsed since the Congress held at Lisbon in 1935. The second of these Reports dealt with a single problem of zoological nomenclature, the interpretation of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles Internationales*, a subject on which at the Final Plenary Session of the Twelfth (Lisbon) Congress the Commission had been instructed to prepare a Report for consideration by the

Thirteenth Congress, the Lisbon Congress hoping that, by this means it would be possible to overcome certain difficulties which had arisen in regard to this matter at the Eleventh Congress held at Padua in 1930.

3. The Section on Nomenclature at Paris agreed, *inter alia*, to recommend that the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature should be requested by the Congress in Plenary Session to publish in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" the minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature (and also those of the International Commission), together with the three Reports which the Section had agreed to submit to the Congress. This recommendation was approved by the Congress at the Final Plenary Session held at the Sorbonne, on Tuesday, 27th July 1948. Immediately after the close of the Congress, this request was conveyed to the International Trust, which thereupon decided to allot the present volume (volume 5) of the "Bulletin" for the publication of the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature and of the three Reports submitted to the Congress.

4. On the occasion of previous International Congresses of Zoology, the Minutes of the meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, together with the Report that had been prepared by the Commission and submitted, with the authority of the Section on Nomenclature, to the Congress for approval, have been published in the volume containing the official *Comptes Rendus* of the Congress prepared by the Secretary-General. On the present occasion it was considered by the Secretary-General of the Congress, after consultation with the President, that the publication of these records *in extenso* in the official *Comptes Rendus* would involve an unjustifiably heavy expense, having regard to the fact that, at the request of the Congress, the whole of these documents was to be published by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature". In these circumstances it was decided by the authorities of the Congress not to publish the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature in the *Comptes Rendus* of the Congress and, as regards the Reports submitted to the Congress by the Section, to publish only extracts from the principal Report relating to the work performed during the Paris Congress, notes being added at appropriate points in the *Comptes Rendus* drawing the attention of members of the Congress to the fact that arrangements had been made for the publication of the full text of these records in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature". This arrangement was concurred in by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, which thus, at the request of the authorities of the Congress, assumed sole responsibility for the publication of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and of the full text of the Reports submitted by the Section on Nomenclature to that Congress.

5. In view both of the heavy expenditure and of the large amount of additional work which would have been involved, it was not considered that it would be reasonable to ask the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature to follow, in relation to the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, a procedure similar to that which they had agreed to adopt in relation to the Minutes of the Meetings of the International Commission on Zoological

Nomenclature, that is, to submit by airmail, for approval, a copy of the draft of the Minutes for approval to each of the members of the Congress by whom the meetings had been attended. Nor was it considered that, apart from the question of expense, there would have been any call for such a procedure in the case of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, having regard to the fact that, in spite of the wide range and large number of matters discussed by the Section, there had been absolute unanimity on every matter dealt with by the Section, with the exception of one individual nomenclatorial case (relating to the relative advantages of the use of the name *Bilharzia* on the one hand and that of *Schistosoma* on the other hand), as regards which a note that the decision taken was not unanimous had been duly recorded in the Minutes. In agreement with the authorities of the Congress it was accordingly decided that the needs of the case would be fully met if the International Trust were to send, by airmail, for approval, the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature to each of the Members and Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who had attended the meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, thereby ensuring that the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings held jointly between the Section and the Commission should be subjected to careful simultaneous scrutiny. A request in this sense was submitted to, and approved by, the International Trust. As soon therefore as proofs were received from the printer, copies of the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature were despatched by airmail (on 9th December 1949) to all the Members and Alternate Members of the Commission who attended the Paris Congress, with a request that the draft should be carefully examined for the purpose of ensuring that it represented a true and accurate record of the Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology.

6. In due course replies were received from all the Members and Alternate Members of the Commission who had attended the Paris Congress, with the exception of Commissioner Paul Rode (France) who had died not long after the close of the Congress and Alternate Commissioner Enrique Beltrán (Mexico).^{*} The fourteen (14) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners from whom replies were received all approved the draft of the Minutes of the Section, subject, in one or two cases, to minor drafting or typographical corrections, all of which have been incorporated in the final text of the Minutes. The Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners by whom, under the arrangements approved by the Authorities of the Congress, the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature have been approved are: H. Boschma (Netherlands); J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.); L. di Caporiacco (Italy); Francis Hemming (United Kingdom); E. Hindle (United Kingdom); A. R. Jorge (Portugal); Harold Kirby (U.S.A.); Henning Lemche (Denmark); K. Mansour (Egypt); Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.); N. D. Riley (United Kingdom); R. Spärck (Denmark); V. van Straelen (Belgium); Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.).

7. For the reasons already explained (in paragraph 4 above) the present volume is the sole place of publication of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and of the Reports submitted by the Section, in agreement with the

^{*} See Postscript on page xii.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to the Congress for approval in Plenary Session. Through the kindness of the Secretary-General, it has been possible to include in the present volume (page 131) an extract from the *Comptes Rendus* of the Congress containing the official record of the approval of the recommendations submitted jointly by the Section on Nomenclature and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, signified by the Congress at the Final Plenary Session held at the Sorbonne on Tuesday, 27th July 1948.

8. The terms of the present note have been agreed between Professor E. Fischer-Piette, *Secretary-General, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology*, and myself, as *President of the Section on Nomenclature*.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, July 1948*

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

1st February 1950

Postscript dated 13th June, 1950

I have today received by airmail a letter, dated 9th June 1950, in which, after explaining that until a few weeks ago he had been away from Mexico City and inaccessible for mail, Alternate Commissioner Enrique Beltrán (Mexico) stated that he had now examined the draft of the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature and found himself in full agreement with the text submitted.

2. With the receipt of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán's letter, replies have now been received from all the fifteen (15) Members and Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who attended the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948. The Minutes, as now published, have accordingly been approved by all those to whom, under the arrangements approved by the Authorities of the Congress, the draft of those Minutes was submitted for approval.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, July 1948*

**CLASS AND ORDINAL NAMES USED IN THE OFFICIAL
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECTION OF NOMEN-
CLATURE OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948**

Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature

At their Fifth Meeting held at the Sorbonne on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 1730 hours, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology approved a recommendation submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that an intensive study of the problems involved in securing uniformity in the nomenclature of categories down to, and including, the category Sub-Order, should be made by the Secretary to the International Commission in conjunction with interested specialists, with a view to the submission by that Officer of a comprehensive Report, with recommendations, to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, and proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* by that Congress of provisions relating to this matter. While, therefore, there are at present no rules governing the naming of Classes, Orders and other categories above the family level, the possibility of including in the *Règles* provisions relating to this range of names will be considered by the next International Congress when it meets in Copenhagen in 1953.

2. Thus, in preparing the Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress, I was not able to look to the *Règles* for guidance on the question of the names to be used to indicate the position in the Animal Kingdom of the genera and species, the names of which had been considered by the Section. If only to facilitate the task of literature-recording serials such as the *Zoological Record*, it was clearly desirable that some indication on this subject should be given in the Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature. In these circumstances, it appeared to me that the best course to adopt would be that followed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in submitting its recommendations and conclusions in regard to the generic and specific trivial names which they had considered, that is, to use, as a matter of convenience Class and Ordinal Names applied to the genera and species concerned by the Secretary to the Commission, when placing the cases before them. The advantage of this course resides in the fact that it secures a reasonable degree of uniformity, while not in any way committing the Section on Nomenclature in favour of one name, as contrasted with another, in those cases where unhappily, owing to the lack of provisions in the *Règles* on this subject, two or more names are commonly used to denote a single Class or Order.

3. It will be clear from the foregoing explanation that the use in the Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of any given Class or

Ordinal Name does not imply that any special mark of approval has thereby been given by the Congress to that name as against some other name for the taxonomic unit concerned.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, July 1948*

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

26th January 1950.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1.

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY HELD IN PARIS IN JULY 1948

(published at the request of the Comité Permanent des Congrès Inter-
nationaux de Zoologie)

MINUTES of the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948 at 0900 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Eighth Meeting of the
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

	Page
1. Procedure to be adopted by the Section on Nomenclature during its Paris Session	1
2. Emendation of <i>Psodos</i> Treitschke, 1827, to <i>Psolos</i> (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera)	3
3. Extension and incorporation in the <i>Règles</i> of the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ..	5
4. Proposed incorporation in the <i>Règles</i> of a provision establishing a Law of Prescription limiting the scope of the Law of Priority	13
5. Nomenclature of Protozoan and other parasites of Man	19
6. Meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the <i>Règles</i>	23
7. Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: date and time appointed	26

MINUTES of the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948 at 0900 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Tenth Meeting of the
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

1. Nomenclature of supergeneric groups below family level	28
2. Nomenclature of Families and Sub-Families	29
3. Proposed recognition of the concepts "grade" and "pseudogenus"	30

Second Meeting (<i>continued</i>)	Page
4. Nomenclature of fossil fragments of the kind known as organites and sclerites in invertebrates	31
5. Propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet: procedure proposed in regard to	32
6. Proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in Clerck, 1757, <i>Aranei svecici</i> , notwithstanding that that work was published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature	33
7. Work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period 1935-1948	36
8. Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on action taken at its present (Paris) Session in regard to matters of personnel and recommendations on such matters submitted to the Congress for approval	47
9. Despatch of a telegram to Dr. Karl Jordan offering him the Office of Honorary Life President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	54
10. Thanks to UNESCO for financial assistance granted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	54
11. Thanks to donors of contributions to the funds of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	55
12. Communication addressed to the Congress on behalf of the Austrian zoologists	55
13. Amendment of the <i>Règles</i> : proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:	56
(i) The programme for the reform of the <i>Règles</i> advocated by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	57
(ii) The recommendations of the Commission regarding the method to be adopted to give effect to the decisions of the Congress for the reform of the <i>Règles</i>	58
(iii) Meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Article 25	59
(iv) Proposed establishment of rules governing the naming of infra-subspecific forms	60
(v) The Law of Homonymy in relation to the names of species, subspecies and infra-subspecific forms	63

Second Meeting (<i>continued</i>)	Page
13. Amendment of the <i>Règles</i> : proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (<i>continued</i>)	
(vi) Codification of the interpretations of the <i>Règles</i> given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in <i>Opinions</i> and of the resolutions incorporated in the Commission's <i>Declarations</i>	67
(vii) Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the <i>Règles</i>	69
(a) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 6	69
(b) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Papers I.C. (48) 11 & 13	70
(c) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 12	70
(d) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 14	72
(e) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 15	73
14. Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: date and time appointed	75

Appendix to Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature

Correspondence between the President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948, and the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna :

(a) Communication addressed by the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna and other Austrian zoologists to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (communication handed to the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the opening day of the Congress)	77
(b) Letter (Z.N.(G.)36) dated 29th July, 1948, from the President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948, to the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna	78

**MINUTES of the Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature
held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on
Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 0930 hours.**

*(Meeting held concurrently with the Eleventh Meeting of the
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)*

	<i>Page</i>
1. Apology by the President for late arrival	81
2. Programme for the Meetings to be held during Monday, 26th July, 1948	82
3. Election of Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) to be an Alternate Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomen- clature	83
4. Withdrawal of Professor R. Spärck and nomination of Dr. H. Lemche as the Danish Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	83
5. Report to the Congress submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	84
6. Proposal that the <i>Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie</i> be asked to propose to the Congress a Resolution to be sent to UNESCO stressing the extreme importance of the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ..	89
7. Fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the <i>Règles</i> (Paper I.C. (48) 16): procedure proposed in regard to	90
8. Seventeen proposals for the amendment or clarification of the <i>Règles</i>	91
9. <i>Necator</i> Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda): validation of erroneous entry in the <i>Official List of Generic Names in Zoology</i>	93
10. Applications relating to certain generic names in the Phylum Mollusca	93
11. Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: time appointed ..	94

**MINUTES of the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature
held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on
Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1445 hours.**

*(Meeting held concurrently with the Twelfth Meeting of the
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)*

1. Procedure to be adopted during the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature	95
--	----

Fourth Meeting (<i>continued</i>)	<i>Page</i>
2. Type species of the genus <i>Gryphaca</i> Lamarek, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda)	96
3. Communications announced but not yet made to the Section : procedure to be adopted in regard to	98
4. Proposals relating to three individual nomenclatorial problems ..	98
5. Fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the <i>Règles</i> (Paper I.C. (48) 17)	100
6. Sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the <i>Règles</i> (Paper I.C. (48) 18)	101
7. Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : time appointed ..	103

**MINUTES of the Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature
held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on
Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1730 hours.**

*(Meeting held concurrently with the Thirteenth Meeting of the
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)*

1. Eight applications on individual cases submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Paper I.C. (48) 19)	104
2. Two applications published in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"	105
3. Eighteen applications published in Part 8 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"	106
4. Twenty-three applications published in Part 9 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"	108
5. Report to the Congress : supplementary items	110
6. Sixth (and Final) Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : time appointed	111

**MINUTES of the Sixth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature
held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on
Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 2030 hours.**

*(Meeting held concurrently with the Fourteenth Meeting of the
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)*

1. Fourteen applications published in Part 10 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"	112
--	-----

Sixth Meeting (<i>continued</i>)	Page
2. Seventeen applications published in Part 11 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"	113
3. Twenty-one applications submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by individual specialists	115
4. Article 25 : additional provisions relating to trivial names which, prior to being published in accordance with the provisions of Article 25, were either manuscript names or <i>nomina nuda</i> ..	118
5. Authorship of new names and method to be adopted in citing authors' names : supplementary provisions	119
6. Approval of certain recommendations embodied in notes attached to re-issues of old <i>Opinions</i> or as appendices to new <i>Opinions</i> ..	120
7. Re-issue of the older of the <i>Opinions</i> rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : arrangements for ..	120
8. Nomenclature of the human malaria parasites	121
9. "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" : supplementary decisions regarding	122
10. Editorial Committee charged with the duty of editing the revised text of the <i>Règles</i> : composition of	123
11. Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : insertion of a reference to the composition of the Editorial Committee and other matters	124
12. International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : internal procedure during inter-Congress periods	125
13. Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Paris Session : arrangements for securing an agreed text	125
14. Thanks of the Section on Nomenclature to the members of the Congress who had served as Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	125
15. Rising Vote of Thanks to Mr. Francis Hemming for his conduct of the Office of President of the Section on Nomenclature	126
16. Vote of Thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress and to the Authorities of the Congress generally	128
17. Close of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948	128

PART 2.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT ITS FINAL PLENARY
SESSION HELD IN PARIS ON 27th JULY, 1948

(extracts relating to zoological nomenclature)

	<i>Page</i>
Extraits de la Séance de Clôture	131

PART 3.

REPORTS SUBMITTED JOINTLY BY THE SECTION ON
NOMENCLATURE AND BY THE INTERNATIONAL COM-
MISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE TO THE
THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY
AT ITS FINAL PLENARY SESSION HELD IN PARIS ON
27th JULY, 1948

Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomen- clature to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology	135
Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the use of the expression "nomenclature binaire" in the "Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique"	152
Report by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the work of the Secretariat of the Commission during the period 1936-1948	169

Alphabetical Subject Index.

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts of the present
Volume.

PART 1.

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

OF THE

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

OF ZOOLOGY

HELD IN

PARIS IN JULY 1948



THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the First Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 0900 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Eighth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
M. H. Berthet (France)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiaccio (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. Dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Procedure to be adopted by the Section on Nomenclature during Paris Meeting

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at former meetings of the Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had normally completed its deliberations shortly after the opening of the Congress the Commission having assembled for this purpose some days before the Congress opened. This procedure had certain advantages but it suffered from the objection that it rendered it impossible for the Commission to work closely with the members of the Congress, few of whom arrived at the seat of the Congress until the

eve of the opening day. On the present occasion the Commission had not been able to hold preliminary meetings of this kind. On the other hand, exceptionally far-reaching measures had been taken to prepare the Agenda for the meeting of the Commission, a large series of important papers having been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the important questions awaiting consideration. To facilitate that consideration the Commission had agreed to suspend their By-Laws for the duration of the present Session. These measures, coupled with a high sense of responsibility on the part of the members of the Commission regarding the importance and urgency of many of the nomenclatorial questions awaiting decision, had enabled the Commission to make rapid progress during the seven meetings which had already been held. In large part this result had been secured as the result of a decision taken on the opening day that all the meetings of the Commission should be held in public. This decision represented a complete break with the former practice of the Commission but had been fully justified both by the opportunity which it had afforded to the Commission to bring other specialists into consultation and by the fact that it had enabled members of the Congress who were interested in questions of zoological nomenclature actively to participate in the preparation of the proposals which would in due course be submitted by the Commission to the Section. Most of the members of the Congress attending the present meeting had participated in the work of the Commission in this way and were thus thoroughly conversant with the issues involved.

The Section on Nomenclature of the present Congress had received notice from a considerable number of members of the Congress of their intention to present communications on a variety of interesting aspects of zoological nomenclature. He (the President) proposed that each meeting of the Section should be devoted partly to the consideration of reports from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the progress of its work and partly to receiving from members of the Congress the communications of which notice had been given. The Commission were anxious to work in the closest relations with the Section and to this end it was proposed that meetings of the Section should be held concurrently with meetings of the Commission. As President of the Section, he intended to permit a wide latitude of discussion at the meetings of the Section, but if disagreement were to arise on any particular question calling for action, it would be necessary to reserve the position of the Commission in order to prevent the recurrence of events such as those which had marred the

harmony of the proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature at Padua in 1930. There was every reason, however, to expect that this reservation would be of a purely formal character, for the discussions at the public meetings of the Commission encouraged the hope that the Section, like the Commission, would approach its task in a constructive spirit and with a desire to secure practical results through mutual understanding and common effort.

Continuing, the President said that, if it were found, as the result of discussion, that there was a likelihood that the Commission, given the opportunity, would be able to return an immediate answer on some of the questions raised in the communications which were to be made to the Section by individual members of the Congress, it was his intention to propose a brief adjournment of the meeting of the Section in order to permit of the necessary discussions between the members of the Commission.

Discussions at meetings of the Section would be either in French or English, the official languages respectively of the Congress and the Commission.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the statement by the President regarding the procedure to be adopted during the present Session of the Section.

**Emendation of
Psodos Treitschke,
1827, to *Psolos*
(Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera)**

2. M. H. BERTHET (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Un point de nomenclature. Doit-on dire '*Psodos*' et non '*Psolos*' Tr. ? (Lep. Geometridae) "¹. M. Berthet explained that this communication, which had been published by him before the outbreak of the recent war (1938, *Bull. Soc. ent. France*, **43** : 151-152), was concerned with the orthography of the generic name which, when published by Treitschke (1827, in Ochsenheimer, *Schmett. Europa*, 6 (1) : 254), was spelt *Psodos*. Treitschke had added at the end of his description of this genus that this name was derived from the Greek word Πσόδος which, like the word σποδῖος, had the meaning ash-coloured. It should be noted that the use for the first of these words of the initial letters pi and sigma, instead of the letter Psi, was a horrible barbarism which could only be due to a slip of the pen, a printers' error or to an error of transcription. Treitschke stated in his definition of this genus that the ground colour of the species which he referred to it was black. There was no such Greek word as that cited by Treitschke, but there was a very similar word, namely ψολος, which had the meaning "smoke" or "soot", a meaning which was entirely consistent both with Treitschke's diagnosis and with the appearance of the alpine species

¹ For the text of M. Berthet's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 157.

concerned, which were very well figured in Volume 4 of Culot's "Noctuelles et Géomètres d'Europe". The name, as published by Treitschke, differed from *Psolos* only by the last letter but two, which in the Greek alphabet was the letter delta instead of the letter lamda. He (M. Berthet) had no doubt that the substitution of the letter "d" for the letter "l" in the transliteration of this word was due to an error. Such an error could easily occur in view of the great similarity of the two Greek letters, especially when these were written in capitals. He accordingly considered that the present was a case to which Article 19 of the *Règles* applied and was of the opinion that the spelling of this generic name should be emended from *Psodos* to *Psolos*.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the question of the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles* raised questions of difficulty, everything depending in any given case on whether a "faute d'orthographe", a "faute de transcription" or a "faute d'impression" was or was not "évident". The whole of the group of problems raised by this Article required, in the opinion of the International Commission, very careful examination with a view to the substitution in the *Règles* of a more readily workable provision for that embodied in the present Article. The present case was much simpler than many which arose under this Article owing to the fact that the author of the generic name in question had attempted to indicate the origin of the word selected by specifying the Greek word from which it was derived. The issues involved had been stated by M. Berthet and it might be possible for the Commission to come to an immediate decision in view of the close similarity between the present case and that dealt with by the Commission in their *Opinion* 36 (1911, *Smithson. misc. Coll.*, 2013:84). In that case the Commission had had to consider whether three names (*Trioxocera*, *Dioxocera*, *Pentoxocera*) should be emended by the substitution of one letter for another (the letter "z" for the letter "x") in the light of a partially incorrect statement by the original author of these names regarding their derivation from the Greek. He accordingly proposed that the meeting of the Section should be adjourned for a short time to enable the members of the Commission to consider the case submitted by M. Berthet.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider this case.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the case submitted by M. Berthet had been considered by the Commission which was unanimously of

the opinion that the case for the emendation of the name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827, to *Psolos* under the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles* had been established. A formal *Opinion* to this effect would be rendered by the Commission in due course and at the same time this generic name would be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology". The Section were indebted to M. Berthet for having brought forward this interesting case.

Stability in
nomenclature
versus rigid
priority:
Proposed
extension and
incorporation in the
"Règles" of the
plenary powers of
the International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

3. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) had given notice of his wish to submit on behalf of a large number of Scandinavian zoologists two proposals, each having as its object the promotion of stability in nomenclature at the expense of rigid priority. The first of these proposals was concerned to secure an extension of the plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in cases where the Commission considered that the strict application of those *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity. The second proposal aimed at the recognition in the *Règles* of a Law of Prescription which would safeguard from change names in current use from being upset under the Law of Priority by names published before 1850 but not used in scientific literature since that date. Although these proposals were closely inter-related, it would, in his (the President's) view, be convenient for the Section to discuss each separately, though naturally it would be open to the Section, if it so desired, to consider the two proposals in relation to one another after it had considered each in isolation. He added that he had received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) a proposal very similar to the second of Dr. Lemche's proposals. He invited Dr. Lemche to place the first of his proposals before the Section.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that the proposal which he now brought forward was submitted on behalf of a large and representative group of Scandinavian zoologists actively engaged in systematic or economic work, largely in the field of entomology². He had furnished the text of his proposal to the President of the Section in advance of the meeting of the Congress, and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his personal use. This proposal was designed to extend the plenary powers now possessed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature both by speeding up and by simplifying the procedure prescribed by the Congress in 1913. The changes proposed were: (1) the period of notice required to be given by the Commission before taking action on an application for the use of the

² For the text of Dr. Lemche's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 158—159.

plenary powers to be reduced from 12 months to 6 months ; (2) the deletion of the existing provision under which the Commission were bound to give the prescribed notice in two or more of five specified journals, none of which were commonly consulted by systematic zoologists and the substitution for this provision of one requiring the publication of notices in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and granting the Commission discretion to select other appropriate journals in which to publish these notices, these journals naturally varying according to the subject matter of the individual application concerned ; (3) the repeal of the provision requiring absolute unanimity in the Commission as a condition for the acceptance by the Commission of a proposal for the suspension of the *Règles* under the plenary powers, and the substitution for the existing *Liberum Veto* of a provision authorising the Commission to use its plenary powers in any case where there was a two-thirds majority in the Commission in favour of so doing ; (4) the repeal of the existing provision under which, when two-thirds or more but not all of the Commissioners voting were in favour of the suspension of the *Règles*, the case was referred to the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress who thereupon appointed a special Board of Three Members, whose decision, either unanimous or by a majority, was final, and the substitution for this provision of one under which, when the voting on a proposal for the suspension of the *Règles* shows neither a two-thirds majority in favour nor a majority of two-thirds against suspension of the *Règles*, the case should be referred to the Section on Nomenclature, which, after discussion, would be free to authorise the Commission to re-examine the case and reach a decision thereon by a simple majority ; (5) the insertion of a provision placing on an equal footing every type of application where it could be shown that confusion rather than uniformity is likely to result from the strict application of the *Règles*, the special case of applications relating to the transfer of a name from one species to another being dealt with in future under the procedure suggested in (7) below ; (6) the insertion of an express direction to the Commission to reach decisions on applications for the suspension of the *Règles* as rapidly as is consistent with a proper study of the issues involved in each case ; (7) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging that, in cases involving the transfer of a name from one species to another, the problem should be brought to the attention of the Commission as soon as possible after it was discovered that a strict application of the *Règles* would lead to a transfer of this kind and that, pending a decision by the Commission on that application, the customary name should be retained for the species

concerned, in preference to the name which should strictly be used under the *Règles*.

Continuing, DR. LEMCHE said that he hoped that the Section on Nomenclature and also the Commission would give the most serious and sympathetic consideration to the proposal which he had just outlined. It was a very moderate proposal and, in the view of the zoologists by whom it was submitted, represented the minimum change necessary to meet the present situation. The Scandinavian zoologists who put forward this proposal were deeply concerned at what appeared to be the unduly strict way in which the Law of Priority was too often followed. This concern was heightened by the conviction that, in spite of its efforts, the Commission was unable to deal satisfactorily with this class of case under the limited powers at present conferred upon it.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as those of the members of the Section who had attended the recent meetings of the Commission were aware, the problem raised by Dr. Lemche's proposal had received the most detailed consideration by the Commission during the last few days. The Commission agreed that the present situation was unsatisfactory from a number of points of view and that it was essential that during the present Congress adequate remedies should be devised. In the choice of the remedies to be recommended, the Commission felt bound, however, to give due weight to the views of all types of zoologist. He asked the Section to believe that, if the recommendations submitted by the Commission appeared timid and lacking in vision, this was due not to any faint-heartedness on the part of the Commission or to any failure to recognise the profound dissatisfaction felt by many zoologists at the numerous changes in scientific names which were still taking place as the result of a strict application of the Law of Priority. The Commission was, however, the trustee for all zoologists and it was its duty therefore to steer a middle course in this matter between, on the one hand, the views held by those zoologists who believed that an adequate degree of stability in nomenclature could be secured only by placing some limitation upon the Law of Priority and on the other hand the views of those zoologists who regarded the Law of Priority as the sheet anchor of zoological nomenclature and were opposed therefore to any curtailment in the vigour of that Law. In pursuing this policy the Commission would, no doubt, be criticised by the hotheads in either camp, but, in view of the importance of securing the maximum degree of agreement regarding the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles*, the policy of the

Commission in this matter was, he was convinced, the one most likely to serve the common interest.

The proposals which he (the President) had now to lay before the Section on behalf of the Commission were general in character, being concerned not only with the special problem of the scope of the plenary powers entrusted to the Commission by the Congress but also with the reform of the procedure of the Commission in relation to applications of other kinds and with the reform of the Commission as a body. As the Section would see, the Commission looked upon this entire group of proposals as forming a single closely-integrated plan of reform. The adoption of the plan now submitted would, the Commission believed, secure for it a higher degree of efficiency and, in particular, a much greater speed in operation than that ever previously achieved. In approaching this problem the Commission had been inspired by a desire both to make the Commission as a body more genuinely representative and more genuinely international in character and also to secure the maximum degree of reform in the procedure of the Commission that could be achieved. The proposals now submitted followed the general lines set out in Commission Papers I.C.(48)3 and 4, copies of which had already been distributed. Additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use.

On the question of the composition of the Commission as a body, the Commission felt that, having regard to the heavy responsibilities with which the Commission was charged, every possible measure should be taken to broaden the basis of the membership of the Commission and thereby to enhance its authority. The Commission accordingly proposed that the existing upper limit of the membership of the Commission should be abolished, but a lower limit of 18 retained. Under this system it would be possible for zoologists of any country in which any considerable volume of zoological work was being carried on to secure direct representation upon the Commission, if they so desired. As regards the mode of electing members of the Commission, it was proposed that nominations should be made by or through the leading scientific bodies in the countries concerned; the election would be made either by the Congress (in Congress years) or by the Commission itself (acting through its Executive Committee) at other times. In this respect the procedure would follow existing practice. It would be the duty of the Executive Committee to secure a proper balance in the membership of the Commission both of different types of knowledge in systematic and applied zoology and also of geographical representation. As at

present, one-third of the total membership of the Commission would retire automatically at each meeting of the Congress. This system would, by its flexibility, secure both a high degree of direct representation of the zoologists of the various countries and also an adequate degree of control by the Congress over the membership of the Commission. In addition, it was proposed that the Commission should be free to summon to its membership specialists of outstanding distinction in a particular field, irrespective of their nationality. From the indications already received by the Commission both before and since the opening of the present Congress, it was evident that the reforms described above were assured of a wide welcome from zoologists in many countries which, through the limitation hitherto imposed on the membership of the Commission, had till now been excluded from representation.

The Commission hoped also that the Congress would take the present opportunity to institute certain minor reforms in the regulations governing the membership of the Commission. It was desirable (1) that the Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the Commission, should be empowered to grant leave of absence to a member of the Commission in certain circumstances and to appoint an Alternate Member to act in his place, an Alternate Member so appointed to have full voting rights in exactly the same way as Alternate Members appointed by the Commission to take the place, during meetings held at the Congress, of members of the Commission who were unable to be present; (2) that Commissioners who failed to vote on proposed *Opinions* or *Declarations* on five successive occasions should be liable to be removed; (3) that, on incurring any of certain specified disabilities (imprisonment, bankruptcy, insanity), a member of the Commission should vacate his position as such; (4) that a member of the Commission should be free to resign his membership on giving notice in writing.

Turning to the question of the procedure of the Commission, which was dealt with in detail in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4, the President said that the members of the Commission were very conscious of the fact that, as a body, the Commission was open to criticism on the ground of the long period commonly required to obtain decisions on applications submitted to it. In part, these long delays were due to the inevitable difficulties which confronted any organisation which met only at long intervals and had therefore to conduct most of its business by correspondence. To a considerable extent, however, the slow-moving character of the Commission was due to faulty and inadequate machinery. In some respects the remedy lay

in the hands of the Commission itself, but in others the Commission needed the assistance of the Section on Nomenclature and the Congress before suitable remedies could be found. Under the first of these heads, the most serious stumbling-block to efficiency was the *Liberum Veto* gratuitously imposed by the Commission on itself in 1910, so far as concerned proposals affecting the reform of the *Règles*. At the present Session the Commission had agreed to annul the vote taken by themselves on this subject nearly 40 years ago and had adopted a much more business-like system, under which in future any proposal for the amendment or alteration of the *Règles* could, after the expiry of a period of six months from the date on which it was submitted by the Secretary to all the members of the Commission, be adopted as the recommendation of the whole Commission and would be incorporated in a *Declaration* for submission to the next meeting of the Congress, if at least one fourth of the members of the Commission had recorded their votes, and at least two out of every three votes cast were affirmative votes, votes cast by Commissioners who signified their willingness to support whatever view was held by the majority of the Commission being calculated as affirmative votes. In all other cases, except cases involving the use by the Commission of its plenary powers, the procedure would be similar, except that a proposed decision would be adopted as the decision of the whole Commission and incorporated in an *Opinion* if the number of affirmative votes exceeded the number of negative votes, if any. By these and other means the Commission hoped to be able to secure that, as soon as the present arrears of work had been cleared off, it would normally be possible for them to reach a decision on an application within 18 months of its receipt. The Commission proposed to publish an announcement on this subject for the information of the zoological public. It would readily be recognised how great would be the importance of this reform if it could be achieved, in view of the fact that in the past it had commonly taken from 5 to 10 years to obtain a decision from the Commission and not infrequently much longer.

Every effort would be made to live up to this programme but it must be realised that the whole position of the Commission must remain precarious, so long as the despatch of its day-to-day work depended upon the amount of time—either at night or at week-ends—which could be given to it by a spare-time honorary Secretary, who had to earn his living during the day in some other occupation. A substantial grant had been received by the Commission from U.N.E.S.C.O. to defray the cost of technical assis-

tance and office expenses, but, valuable as that was, it provided no solution to the central problem, namely how to secure that a sufficient number of hours of work should be devoted regularly to the direction of the affairs of the Commission. The situation would never be satisfactory until the Commission possessed an income sufficiently large and secure to enable it to employ a highly qualified whole-time salaried official responsible for discharging the bulk of the duties which at present had to be performed by the honorary Secretary.

There remained the special problem of the procedure to be followed by the Commission in dealing with applications for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in particular cases. This was the problem to which the proposal submitted by Dr. Lemche and his colleagues was specially directed. As Dr. Lemche and those members of the Section who had attended the recent meetings of the Commission were aware, this subject had received most careful consideration at the hands of the Commission who had had before them both Dr. Lemche's proposals and also certain less far-reaching proposals submitted by the Secretary. As a result, the Commission had reached conclusions which, though they did not go so far as Dr. Lemche and his colleagues had suggested, nevertheless went some distance in that direction. These conclusions had been reached unanimously by the Commission and had had the full support also of the other members of the Congress who had attended the meeting of the Commission. He (the President) hoped therefore that these conclusions would meet also with the full approval and support of the Section on Nomenclature.

The proposals in regard to the modification of the provisions of the Plenary Powers Resolution of March, 1913 (the text of which was embodied in the Commission's *Declaration* 5), which he now laid before the Section were as follows:—(1) the period of notice to be reduced from 12 months to 6 months; (2) the grant to the Commission of discretion to choose the most appropriate journal in which to give notice of proposals involving the use of the plenary powers, subject to the condition that in every case such notice should be given by the Commission in its own journal, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, and that, of the other journals in which notice should be given, at least one should be a journal published in Europe and one a journal published in America; (3) the obsolete and objectionable *Liberum Veto* to be abolished and in its place a rule adopted under which a proposal for the use of the plenary powers would require a two-thirds majority of the

votes cast in the same way as proposals affecting the text of the *Règles*; (4) consequent upon this change, provisos (b) and (c) to Article 1 of the Resolution of March, 1913, to be repealed, together with Article 2 of that Resolution (which related to the setting-up of Boards of Three Members to consider cases where the Commission was not unanimously in favour of the use of the plenary powers in any given case but two-thirds of the members of the Commission favoured that course), other than the portion relating to the final character of decisions taken by the Commission under the plenary powers. Finally, the Commission recommended that the provisions relating to the use of the plenary powers should be incorporated in the *Règles* as a substantive Article, for those provisions formed as much a part of the international law relating to zoological nomenclature as any of the provisions already included in the *Règles*.

THE PRESIDENT added that the Commission looked upon their proposals for the reform of the membership of the Commission and the proposals for the reform of its procedure as intimately connected with one another. The Commission considered that these proposals constituted a balanced programme, each part of which was as necessary as any other. The Commission asked that the Section should regard these proposals in this light. Finally, the Commission asked also that the proposed reforms in procedure should enter into force forthwith.

The Commission proposed that, if the Congress approved their proposals for the reform of the rules governing the composition and procedure of the Commission, the Commission's By-Laws should be thoroughly revised, both to make them complete and also to distinguish between the organic provisions prescribed by the Congress (and therefore capable of being altered only by the Congress) and the remaining provisions, not being inconsistent with the organic provisions, which had been adopted by the Commission itself and which could be altered by that body.

DR. LEMCHE said that, while the proposals submitted by the Commission for the reform of the plenary powers procedure did not go so far as he and his colleagues had advocated, he recognised that the reformed procedure now proposed was a great improvement on that laid down in 1913. He had taken part in the discussions in the Commission which had led up to the preset proposals and he was prepared to accept them on behalf both of himself and of the Scandinavian zoologists for whom he was acting.

After other members of the Section had signified their concurrence in the proposals put forward by the Commission, MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM

submitted a motion that the proposals in regard to the reform of the rules governing the membership and procedure of the Commission which had been laid before the Section by the President on behalf of the Commission be approved and adopted and that the Section should submit a recommendation to the International Congress of Zoology that they should approve those proposals at the final *Concilium Plenum* of the present meeting of the Congress. The motion proposed by MR. RILEY was thereupon seconded by PROFESSOR E. BELTRÁN (MEXICO). After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire to move an amendment to this proposal and no such amendment having been brought forward, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) added that a reference to this subject would be included in the Report which would in due course be submitted by the Commission to the Section for approval and transmission to the Congress for presentation at the final *Concilium Plenum*.

**Proposed
incorporation in the
"Règles" of a
provision
establishing a Law
of Prescription
limiting the scope
of the Law of
Priority**

4. THE SECTION turned next to consider the second of the two proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in the interest of securing greater stability in nomenclature of which notice had been received from Dr. Lemche³.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that the object of the proposal which he now laid before the Section was to prevent the upsetting, on grounds of priority, of well-established names which had been in common use for upwards of a century. The Law of Priority was of great value, in so far as it served the purpose for which it had originally been adopted, namely, the promotion of uniformity in nomenclature, but it was a defect of that Law that it could be employed to upset well-known names by substituting for them long-forgotten names of earlier date dug up for the purpose from obscure books or journals which had long since passed into oblivion. It was to remedy this defect of the Law of Priority that he and his colleagues in the Scandinavian countries proposed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* which would afford protection to names which had been in general use since the beginning of the year 1850. They accordingly proposed the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision in the following terms: "A name of a genus or species, given before the year 1850 and not used in scientific literature since 1st January 1850, is to be rejected in favour

³ For the text of Dr. Lemche's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 159—161.

of such other name which has been in general use for the genus or species in question since that date."

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he was thoroughly in agreement with the object of the proposal brought forward by Dr. Lemche. Although himself a professional museum worker, he had no sympathy with those who spent their time in unearthing old names and substituting them for "well-known names in current use. It was much to be regretted that time should be wasted in unfruitful work of this kind, which contributed nothing to the knowledge of systematics, when there were so many urgent and important problems awaiting study. Personally, he would like to see also a great development of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the grant of absolute protection against the Law of Priority to names once placed upon that List. He would like, for example, to see the generic nomenclature of the Class Mammalia stabilised by the grant of official approval to the names used in the admirable list published by Dr. G. G. Simpson, of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. If action of this kind could not be taken under the *Règles* as they stood, then let the *Règles* be changed as soon as possible to enable this to be done. Zoologists were tired of endless disputes on questions of priority. What they wanted was stability of nomenclature so that they could get on with their proper work. He urged both the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Congress not to allow themselves to be too timid in this matter. They should keep abreast of the current sentiment of zoologists and, in deference to that sentiment, adopt a statesmanlike and progressive view in this matter.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he was strongly opposed to the digging-up of old names and the unearthing of old books containing forgotten names, and the substitution of those names for well-known names in common use. He suggested that the Section should invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the best means to be adopted for banning the upsetting of well-established names in this way, and to submit a report on this subject to the next meeting of the Congress. If this course were to be agreed upon by the Section, Dr. Lemche would, he hoped, be prepared not to press for an immediate decision on the proposal which he had himself laid before the Section.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that, if the Section so preferred, he would be prepared to fall in with the alternative course suggested by Mr. Riley, and in that event he would himself second Mr. Riley's proposal. What

he and his colleagues were anxious to secure was that an end should be put to the use of the Law of Priority as an instrument for upsetting current nomenclature. Any well-founded proposal to this end would receive the support of his colleagues and himself.

MR. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that he was in thorough agreement with the views which had been expressed. He considered it important that an effective settlement should be reached. If this could not be achieved during the present Congress, he would not offer objection to the proposal made by Mr. Riley, provided that it was made clear that the Congress regarded this question as a matter of urgency and that it was intended that the question should be brought to a definite issue at the next meeting of the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the proposal brought forward by Dr. Lemche dealt with a matter of great importance and it was evident that a growing body of zoologists felt that the present provisions in the *Règles* were not sufficient to secure stability in nomenclature. Dr. Lemche's proposal, as also a similar proposal which had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France), had the same object as that which the Congress had set itself when at Monaco in 1913 they had granted the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in cases where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise occur. The present proposal went considerably further than the Congress had then thought it prudent to go, for it contemplated the automatic rejection of names published before a certain date, where those names had not been used in scientific literature subsequent thereto.

He agreed with the suggestion that this question should be referred to the International Commission for investigation, for the problems involved in working out practicable provisions which would secure the desired object without at the same time giving rise to anomalies were probably greater than appeared on the surface. If the survey to be undertaken by the Commission were to produce the best possible results, it should cover the whole field, and the terms of reference to be given to the Commission should be general in character. He suggested therefore that the Commission should be invited: "to consider generally the problem of how to secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with proposals, to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology." The Commission would thus be able to take

into account all relevant factors, including the whole problem of the adequacy of the plenary powers granted to the Commission and the principles which should govern the use of those powers. This subject, which clearly deserved consideration, had been raised in a document which just before the opening of the present Congress he had received from a group of specialists in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, who, unlike the zoologists attending the present meeting, were in favour of a narrower rather than a wider use of those powers.

MR. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that, if no change was to be made in the mandatory portion of the *Règles* until the next meeting of the Congress five years hence, it was, he thought, important that the present Congress should at least indicate its view on the question raised by Dr. Lemche by adding a *Recommandation* to Article 25 of the *Règles* urging authors who discovered that a well-known name was invalid to refer the case at once to the Commission and to refrain from changing the name in question until a decision on the question had been reached by the Commission.

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) agreed that, if a decision on the general issue was to be deferred until the next meeting of the Congress, it became all the more important that the limited action proposed by Mr. Delacour should be taken by the present Congress. He accordingly seconded Mr. Delacour's proposal.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he was in sympathy with the views expressed by Mr. Delacour and Mr. Morrison-Scott. The insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* of the kind proposed would be in harmony with the general view of the International Commission that it was desirable that the *Règles* should indicate, by means of non-mandatory *Recommandations*, the ideal standard of procedure in cases where, without such guidance, some zoologists might follow courses which were at variance with the general will. A *Recommandation* of the kind proposed would be of still greater value if it were to draw special attention to the need for avoiding the upsetting, on technical grounds of priority, of names which were of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other applied fields of biology. Nothing had done more to bring zoological nomenclature into discredit with men of science who were not systematists than the failure of the *Règles* to prevent changes on narrow technical grounds of the names of animals of importance outside the field of systematic zoology.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) said that in the case of generic names it was not only priority which led to the discarding of well-known names, for rectifications in the designations of type species had exactly the same effect. He suggested therefore that words should be added to the proposed *Recommandation* to cover this point.

After further discussion the PRESIDENT said that the Section appeared to be unanimous as to the general line of action to be taken. He proposed therefore to ask the Section to adjourn for a short time to enable him to draw up a form of words giving effect to what appeared to be the general wish, so that the Section might have a concrete proposal on which to continue their discussion. As the action proposed included the addition of a new, though non-mandatory, provision to the *Règles*, it was his duty, as President of the Section, to ascertain the views of the Commission before he formally put the question to the Section. He would take advantage of the proposed adjournment to consult the members of the Commission on this question.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn for a short time to enable the President both to prepare for its consideration a form of words embodying the substance of the preceding discussion and also to consult the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the members of the International Commission were unanimously in favour of the course advocated in the discussion which had taken place in the Section immediately prior to the adjournment. He suggested that effect would be given to that discussion if the Section were now to adopt a resolution on the following lines :—

Proposed Resolution

THE SECTION agree :—

- (1) to take note (a) of the proposal put forward by Dr. H. Lemche (Denmark) for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prohibit the replacement, on grounds of priority, of well-known names by names published prior to 1850 where those names had not subsequently been used in scientific

literature and (b) of the similar proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France);

(2) to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to study the question of how to secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology;

(3) to recommend that, without prejudice to the recommendations to be submitted under (2) above, there should at once be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision:

(a) that, where a worker discovers that a well-known name in common use, particularly a name of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields of biology, is invalid under either the Law of Priority or the Law of Homonymy or, in the case of a generic name, has as its type species a species other than the species commonly accepted as such, that worker should at once report the case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as the Commission may deem to be proper;

(b) that in such a case neither the worker by whom the error in accepted practice is discovered nor any subsequent worker should change that practice by substituting some other name for that in common use until such time as the decision on the future status of the name in question is made known by the said Commission.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense. As the action now contemplated owed its inspiration to the initiative taken by Dr. Lemche and his Scandinavian colleagues, it would be particularly appropriate if he were to move the proposed resolution.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) then proposed, and MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

**Nomenclature of
Protozoan and
other parasites of
Man**

5. PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) then presented his paper on "Les Protozoaires de l'Homme". Professor Beltrán said that at the present time many of the Protozoa parasitic to Man were known by names possessing only a *de facto* basis.⁴ If the *Règles* were to be strictly applied, many of those names would be found to be invalid and in need of replacement. The older literature was highly involved and the solution of the numerous and complicated taxonomic questions required the active co-operation of specialists. He therefore suggested the appointment of a committee of protozoologists charged with the duty of studying the nomenclature of Protozoa, with a view to the submission of recommendations to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the addition to the "Official List" of the names of genera, in those cases where it was found that the names in question were available under the *Règles* for use in the sense in which they were commonly employed, and, in the case of names not found to be so available, for validation by the Commission as a preliminary to their being also placed on the "Official List".

Continuing, Professor Beltrán expressed the view that the greatest care should be taken by the International Commission, when rendering *Opinions*, to confine themselves strictly to nomenclatorial questions. Sufficient attention had not always been paid in the past to this important principle. For example, *Opinion* 99, which dealt with the relative status of the names *Endamoeba* Leidy, 1879, and *Entamoeba* Casagrandi & Barbagello, 1895, contained much matter of a taxonomic character which was totally out of place in a discussion on nomenclature. On the other hand, Professor Beltrán welcomed the policy adopted by the Commission in *Opinion* 104, in which, when stabilising the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites, the Commission had made express provision both for those protozoologists who regarded the quartan and aestivo-autumnal parasites as congeneric and also for those who took the opposite taxonomic view. For the benefit of the former, the Commission had placed on the "Official List" the generic

⁴ For the text of Professor Beltrán's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 162-163.

name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, while for the benefit of the latter they had added also the name *Laverania* Grassi & Feletti, 1890. In this way the Commission had succeeded in stabilising the nomenclature of these important genera, without expressing any view on the taxonomic relationships of the species concerned.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 the International Commission had adopted a resolution (subsequently embodied in *Declaration 10*) welcoming the formation of groups of specialists for the study of the nomenclature of particular groups of the Animal Kingdom. Professor Beltrán's proposal for the appointment of a committee of protozoologists to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa was assured, therefore, of the hearty support of the Commission. That there was a real need for such a committee was evident from the difficulties which had been encountered in regard to the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania*, to which Professor Beltrán had referred, for, although the entries in regard to these names made in the "Official List" were in complete harmony with the universal practice of protozoologists, investigations undertaken recently both by Professor Robert L. Usinger and Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky in the United States and by himself had shown that under the *Règles* those entries were incorrect in almost every particular. In that particular case proposals for validating existing practice would be laid before the Commission later during its present Session, and it was to be hoped therefore that the position as regards these names would shortly be regularised. It was naturally not possible for the Commission itself or for its Secretary to undertake such investigations except in special cases such as the present which had been necessitated by the need to correct the erroneous entries already inadvertently made in the "Official List". In this field therefore the assistance of a committee of specialists such as had been suggested would be of particular value.

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
6th meeting,
Minute 8).

Professor Beltrán had alluded to the need for the Commission to exclude taxonomic considerations when deciding whether to include generic names on the "Official List". In making this observation, Professor Beltrán had raised a point the importance of which was not always sufficiently understood. The object of the "Official List" was to stabilise the use of the names of certain genera for their respective type species. The decision taken in such cases was purely nomenclatorial, though it inevitably carried with it the corollary that the names so stabilised, and no other names, should also be used for any species

which specialists might regard on taxonomic grounds as being congeneric with the type species of the genera concerned. It was no part, however, of the function of the Commission to decide, or for the "Official List" to imply, any view as to the taxonomic limits of genera. He, therefore, welcomed the approval expressed by Professor Beltrán of the action taken by the Commission when in *Opinion* 104 they had placed on the "Official List" not only the oldest generic name (*Plasmodium*) for any of the human malaria parasites but also the name *Laverania* for the benefit of those protozoologists who regarded the aestivo-autumnal parasite (which was the type of that genus) as referable to a different genus from that to which the quartan parasite was assigned. It would be very helpful to the Commission when considering proposals for further additions to the "Official List" if the Congress were now expressly to place on record their approval of the policy of placing two or more generic names on the "Official List" in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus was involved.

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the appointment of the proposed committee had his support, for the object underlying that proposal was to secure that, if well-established nomenclatorial practice and the Law of Priority were to come into conflict with one another, it should be the Law of Priority and not well-established nomenclatorial practice which should go to the wall.

The view was expressed in subsequent discussion that, while it was certainly important to stabilise the names of genera in the Phylum Protozoa containing species which were parasitic to Man, it was equally important to stabilise the names of genera in other Phyla containing such species. It was accordingly suggested that the proposal before the Section should be modified to take account of this consideration. It was realised that the literature involved might be so specialised that it might be found desirable either to divide the proposed committee into panels, each of which would concentrate upon the nomenclature of parasites belonging to a particular Phylum, or to appoint separate committees to undertake such studies.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that his object in bringing forward the proposal which he had laid before the Section was to secure that a start should

be made in the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the parasites of Man. In that proposal he had specified the Phylum Protozoa, for that was the group in which he was specially interested, but he agreed that it would be of advantage to consider the nomenclature of all parasites of Man, irrespective of the Phyla to which they belonged. He accordingly supported the extension of his proposal which had been suggested.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) asked the Section to adjourn for a short time both to permit the members of the Commission to confer together and to enable him to draft a form of words to give effect to the general sense of the discussion.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn for a short time for the purposes indicated by the President.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the members of the Commission were unanimously in favour of the course which had been advocated in the discussion which had taken place in the Section immediately prior to the adjournment. He suggested that effect would be given to that discussion if the Section were now to adopt a resolution on the following lines :—

Proposed Resolution

THE SECTION agree :—

- (1) to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to concert with specialists for the appointment of a committee or committees to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa and other Phyla containing species parasitic to Man and to make proposals to the Commission for the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", whether under the plenary powers or otherwise, of the names of leading genera in those Phyla, particularly genera containing species parasitic to Man, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the species concerned ;
- (2) to place on record, for the guidance of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, their view that, in order to eliminate taxonomic problems from consideration when names are added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", it is desirable that two or more generic names should be placed on that List, in cases where specialists are agreed on the importance

of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but are not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus is involved.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) then proposed, and Mr. C. F. DOS PASSOS (U.S.A.) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the "Règles"

6. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next item to be considered was the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" (binary nomenclature) as used in the *Règles*. The Section would recall that the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 had charged the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to examine, and to submit to the present Congress a Report on, the meaning of the foregoing expression as used in the *Règles*. This action had been taken in the hope that an objective study of this subject, undertaken in consultation with leading specialists, would provide a means for bringing to an end the deplorable controversy which for so long had centred round this subject and which had come to a head in 1930 as the result of hasty and ill-considered action taken in the Section on Nomenclature at the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology. In the interval which had elapsed since the Lisbon Congress, this problem had been the subject of extensive discussions carried out on behalf of the Commission by their Secretary by correspondence with leading specialists in different parts of the world on the basis of a paper published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in which he had set out the issues involved and by extensive personal discussions at meetings held both in America and in Europe. It was extremely gratifying to find that, as the result of these discussions, the ground had

been cleared for a solution of this problem on terms which would be mutually acceptable to zoologists of all shades of opinion. A draft Report had been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the basis of these discussions. Copies of this document had been distributed under cover of Commission Paper **I.C.(48)5** and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use. The Commission had unanimously approved and adopted this Report and had authorised and requested the Secretary to sign it on their behalf and submit it to the President of the Section in discharge of the duty committed to the Commission by the Lisbon Congress.

The Commission pointed out in this Report that two distinct questions were involved : (1) What was the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as actually used in Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles* ? (2) Is that meaning the meaning which it is the general wish of zoologists should be conveyed by those Articles, and, if not, what change in the wording of those Articles is desirable ? The examination carried out into the first of these questions had shown conclusively that, as used in the two Articles of the *Règles* concerned, the expression " nomenclature binaire " bore a meaning identical with that which would have been conveyed if, instead of that expression, the expression " nomenclature binominale " had been employed. As regards the second of the two questions involved, it was evident from the consultations which had been held that the foregoing meaning was also the meaning which the general body of zoologists desired should be conveyed by Articles 25 and 26, provided that suitable safeguards were introduced (to protect certain generic names in common use which had been published subsequent to 1757 by authors who, while accepting the proposition that the name of a species should convey two concepts, that of the genus and that of the species, did not give effect to that proposition by using the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature.) Accordingly, in the Report now submitted, the Commission recommended that both in Article 25 and in Article 26 the expression " nomenclature binominale " should be substituted for the expression " nomenclature binaire " and that the plenary powers should be used to protect the special class of generic names to which reference had just been made. It was further agreed that there should be attached to the *Règles* a schedule, to be known as the First Schedule (in contrast to the existing *Appendice*, which it was proposed should in future be known as the " Second Schedule "), in which should be inserted particulars of every decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers. A record

would therefore be found in this Schedule of every decision taken by the Commission to validate generic names published by non-binominal authors or to validate books containing such names. Further, the Commission proposed that the Article which (earlier in the present meeting) the Section had agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* to incorporate the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913, subject to certain amendments agreed upon by the Section, should contain a provision exempting applications for the validation of generic names or of books of the kind specified above from the regulations prescribing the giving of specified notice required in other cases involving the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. In one case of outstanding importance to ornithologists, namely, the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in his "*Ornithologia*", the Commission had agreed to take action at once by placing that book in the proposed First Schedule to the *Règles*, thereby securing the immediate availability of the names in question. Consequential upon the foregoing conclusions, the Commission had agreed to cancel *Opinion* 20 (which contained an incorrect interpretation of the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire") and *Opinion* 37 (which stated—incorrectly—that under the existing *Règles* the generic names in Brisson's "*Ornithologia*" were nomenclatorially available) and to modify (in a manner which the President then explained) the wording of the "summary" of *Opinion* 24 and the title of *Opinion* 35.

In submitting the present Report to the Section and, through the Section, to the Congress, the Commission were happy to record that they had been able to achieve the unanimous settlement of a problem which had baffled every previous attempt to secure general agreement.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the Commission was to be congratulated on the way in which they had discharged the duty imposed upon them by the Lisbon Congress. The task had been one of great difficulty, and the successful outcome of the labours of the Commission would, he felt sure, be warmly welcomed by the Section. He had pleasure in proposing the adoption of the Report of the Commission and its submission to the Congress.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that he wished to associate himself with the tribute just paid to the work of the Commission in this matter. He seconded the motion proposed by Mr. Riley.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then enquired whether any other member wished to comment on the Report and in particular whether any member

wished to move an amendment to the motion which had just been proposed. No such amendment was, however, proposed. THE PRESIDENT then put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

**Second Meeting
of the Section on
Nomenclature :
date and time
appointed**

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he did not propose to lay any further business before the Section at its present meeting. Good progress had been made by the Section in the important task before them, and there was every reason to hope that before the end of the Congress the Section would have completed the whole of their programme. The next meeting of the Section would be held at the same place on the morning of the following day, Saturday, 24th July, at 09.00 hours.

(The Section thereupon adjourned at 12.05 hours)

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Second Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre
Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948, at 0900 hours

(Meeting held concurrently with the Tenth Meeting of the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. C. F. Dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France) (*Secretary-General to the
Congress*)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to
the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer to the International
Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

**Nomenclature of
suprageneric
groups below
family level**

1. PROFESSOR R. JEANNEL (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Sur la nomenclature des groupements supragénériques"⁵. After pointing out that zoologists were agreed that the authors of systems of classification were free to coin words to denote the great systematic categories from the Class downwards as far as the Sub-Order, Professor Jeannel observed that the position was quite different in the case of the names of families, sub-families and tribes. For these categories the *Règles* provided that the Law of Priority applied to the earliest proposed of the suprageneric units, provided that the name was formed from the stem of the name of a genus contained in the group and that the generic name in question was itself an available name and that there was added to the stem a particular Latin termination. The terminations in question were "-idae" for the names of families, "-inae" for the names of sub-families, "-ini" for the names of tribes. Professor Jeannel then raised two questions in regard to the nomenclature of this class of category.

Under the first of these heads, Professor Jeannel observed that it was absurd to use the termination "-inae" to denote a sub-family and the termination "-ini" to denote a tribe, for the first of these words was no more than the feminine of the second. The present method of denoting sub-families by the use of a feminine termination led to barbarisms resulting from the fact that it was customary in everyday speech to treat them as though they were of the masculine gender. He suggested, therefore, that a new termination should be adopted to denote the category of sub-family and that that termination should be such that the word so formed would be of the masculine gender. He accordingly proposed the adoption of the termination "-itae".

Passing to the second of the questions which he wished to raise, Professor Jeannel said that it was not possible to formulate for the selection of the names of families, sub-families and tribes rigid rules strictly based upon priority. It was, in his view, necessary to take account of two factors: (1) priority; (2) legitimacy. The first of these principles was recognised in the existing provisions of the *Règles*—to which he had already referred. He could not accept the proposition advanced by Bradley in 1928 that, as a condition precedent to the acceptance of a name proposed for one of these categories, that name must have been published in the form of a Latin plural, for such a stipulation would rule out most unfairly the work of the great masters of the early XIXth century, to whom entomologists owed the foundations of the systematics of insects. When

⁵ For the text of Professor Jeannel's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 164-165.

he had referred to the principle of legitimacy he had had in mind such cases as those where a tribe was established for the reception of some aberrant genus (as Schaum in 1870 had established the tribe *Mormolycini* for the species *Mormolyce phylloides*), and it was later found that the species so separated should in fact be referred to a well-defined family of later date (as, in the example cited above, had happened when it was found by Chaudoir that the genus *Mormolyce* should be referred to the family containing the Thyreopterids. In such a case it would be an illegitimate use of priority to apply the name *Mormolycidae* (based upon the tribe name *Mormolycini* originally proposed by Schaum) to the whole family as defined later by Chaudoir. A provision should, he suggested, be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with this class of case. He agreed that any provision recognising the principle of legitimacy would inevitably contain a subjective element. He considered, however, that this was a case where a certain discretion should be allowed to the authors of monographs. After a time the customary usage so established would acquire the force of law.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the paper presented by Professor Jeannel was very opportune, for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had decided at a meeting held the previous day that the existing provisions (Articles 4 and 5) in the *Règles* in regard to the names of families and sub-families were totally inadequate and that the position in this part of the field of nomenclature would not be satisfactory until a comprehensive and logical plan covering all aspects of the problem had been worked out and embodied in the *Règles*. The Commission had accordingly invited the Secretary to the Commission to make a thorough study of this problem, in consultation with interested specialists, and to submit a report thereon for their consideration at the meeting to be held during the next (Fourteenth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology. The paper just communicated by Professor Jeannel would form a valuable part of the dossier in this case. He thanked Professor Jeannel for the interesting and valuable contribution which he had made to this subject.

**Nomenclature of
Families and
Sub-families**

2. PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) referred to the paper by Professor E. G. Linsley and himself entitled "The use of new names for preoccupied names in zoological nomenclature", of his wish to present which to the Section he had given notice prior to the opening of the present Congress. In that paper he and Professor Linsley

had raised a number of questions relating to the formation of the names of families and sub-families. As an Alternate Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, he had since taken part in the decision to invite the Secretary to the Commission to carry out the study to which the President had just referred. In the circumstances, he considered that it would be sufficient if the communication by Professor Linsley and himself were embodied in the material to be studied in connection with the proposed review of the problem of family names, and he had handed a copy of their paper to the Secretary to the Commission for this purpose. He did not therefore now desire to communicate the paper to the Section.

**Proposed
recognition of the
concepts "grade"
and "pseudo-
genus"**

3. M. GEORGES DEFLANDRE (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Les notions de grade et de pseudo-genre."⁶ M. Deflandre said that in a recent paper (1941) on the concept of genus as applied to the Silico-flagellids, he had adopted, when dealing with *Naviculopsis* Frenguelli, the expression "grade" in the sense in which that expression had been used by Cuénot (1936) when he wrote: "le pseudo-genre étant polygénétique doit donc être considéré non comme un genre, mais comme un 'grade' (mot de Bather, 1927)". In fact, however, the meaning attached to this expression by Cuénot was not identical with that adopted by Bather. Cuénot had given the following definition: "*Grade* (Bather, 1927). Certainne forme d'organisation qui peut apparaître séparément dans plusieurs lignées parallèles; c'est un pseudo-genre." Bather had referred to grades as "evolutionary stages, separated by horizontal lines indicating time-limits and denoted by an epithet or phrase not interfering with the systematic hierarchy". Later in the same paper Bather had observed that "more genera represent grades of organisation rather than lines of descent". In his (M. Deflandre's) view, it was desirable that the expression "grade" should be restricted to the meaning originally bestowed upon it by Bather. Nevertheless, the definition given by Cuénot corresponded to a precise conception, which was applicable to a number of cases. The concept defined by Cuénot should be rendered concrete by the adoption for it of a special term. Rather than coin a new name for this purpose he (M. Deflandre) proposed that there should be given to the expression "pseudo-genus" (pseudo-genre) a restricted sense corresponding to the definition given by Cuénot.

M. ANDRÉ CHAVAN (FRANCE) said that he thought that many of the apparent "polyphyletic genera" would

⁶ For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 166.

sooner or later be recognised as consisting of a number of true monophyletic genera, to which the ordinary system of nomenclature could be applied. For this reason he thought it would be preferable to wait until our knowledge was sufficiently advanced to subdivide the "pseudo-genera" into their constituent monophyletic parts, to which the normal nomenclature could be applied, rather than to apply a special nomenclature to the "pseudo-genera". In any case the problem called for the most careful consideration, and if it were ultimately found necessary to introduce the concept of a "pseudo-genus" it would be desirable that the Commission should give a precise ruling as to its significance.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) thanked M. Deflandre for the interesting communication which he had just made to the Section. It appeared to him, as he had listened to it, that the subject matter was concerned with technical terminology rather than with nomenclature. The two subjects were, however, closely related to one another and it was important that workers concerned with both subjects should keep in close touch with one another. M. Deflandre's communication would be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for consideration, though, for the reasons which he had explained, it seemed unlikely that the Commission would be able to take any positive action.

**Nomenclature
of fossil fragments
of the kind known
as organites or
sclerites in
invertebrates**

4. M. GEORGES DEFLANDRE then presented, on his behalf and that of Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud, a communication entitled "La nomenclature des fragments fossiles (organites et sclérites) d'Invertébrés". M. Deflandre said that the tendency in applied micropalaeontology to make use of every vestige of organic life found in the sedimentary rocks gave rise to a general problem of nomenclature to which Croneis had proposed a solution. The bestowal of names upon fossil fragments of invertebrates of the kind known as organites or sclerites presented a special problem, for, although such a fragment was sufficient sometimes to characterise a species, more often such a determination was either doubtful or impossible. For practical reasons and because of their use in stratigraphy, it was necessary to designate such fragments by Latin binominal names formed in accordance with the Linnean system. In order, however, to meet the objections to this course expressed by certain biologists and to ward against the risk of erroneous interpretations, for example, attribution to a genus of unknown age, owing to the use of the particular generic name concerned for a microfossil,

⁷ For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre and Mme. Deflandre-Rigaud, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 167.

it seemed desirable to ban the use for such fragments of the terms "genus" and "species" and of the names of genera already established. To deal with this problem, Croneis had proposed that the existing terms employed in biological nomenclature should be replaced for fossil fragments of the kind under discussion by a system of nomenclature based upon the *ordo militaris* of Ancient Rome. Thus, the hierarchy Class-Order-Family-Genus-Species would for the present purpose be replaced by the hierarchy Exercitus-Legio-Cohors-Manipulus-Centuria. Under this system, names belonging to these categories would, on being first published, be followed by *cohors nov.*, *manip. nov.*, *cent. nov.*, etc. It would be desirable that, where a Manipulus appeared to be related morphologically to a living genus, it should be given the name of that genus with the addition of the termination "-ites".

A discussion then took place in which Professor di Caporiacco (Italy), M. Chavan (France) and Professor van Straelen (Belgium) took part. In the course of this discussion certain difficulties were foreseen in the application of a special system of nomenclature for fossil fragments of invertebrates independent of, but co-ordinated in some way with, the existing system of zoological nomenclature.

At the conclusion of this discussion THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, though it was evident that there were great difficulties in the way of accepting the plan formulated by Croneis to which M. Deflandre had drawn attention, the problem presented by these fossil fragments was a real one and deserved careful consideration. For himself, it seemed possible that the solution should be looked for "In the field of technical terminology rather than in that of zoological nomenclature. The Section were grateful to M. Deflandre for having brought this matter to their attention. The communication which he had been good enough to make would be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Propositions
submitted by
Professor Pierre
Bonnet: proposed
procedure in regard
to

5. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) a number of interesting propositions which he desired to lay before the Commission and the Congress⁸. Since his arrival in Paris he had been so fortunate as to be able to have a full discussion with Professor Bonnet in regard to the procedure to be adopted in the handling of these propositions. As a result, he had agreed that the first of these propositions, which was concerned with the

⁸ For the text of the proposals submitted by Professor Bonnet, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 171-179.

status of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757 in his *Aranei svecici*, a matter to which Professor Bonnet and his colleagues attached the greatest importance, should be brought before the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature at the first opportunity during the present Congress. The remaining propositions were concerned with various aspects of the *Règles* and included a number of proposals for drafting amendments and additions. In so far as time permitted, these would be dealt with by the Commission during its Paris Session and proposals in regard to them would be submitted by the Commission to the Section for approval. Any of Professor Bonnet's proposals which could not be dealt with in this way would be considered by the Commission after the close of the Congress and decisions reached as promptly as possible. He proposed therefore now to call upon Professor Bonnet to present his communication in regard to Clerck's Arachnid names.

PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that he was grateful to the President for the arrangements which he had proposed for handling the communications which he had submitted to the Commission. Those arrangements were perfectly satisfactory to him.

Proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in Clerck, 1757, *Aranei Svecici* notwithstanding that that work was published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature

6. PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that he desired to bring forward a proposal relating to the status of the names of spiders published by Clerck in 1757 in his work entitled *Aranei svecici*⁹. This was a matter to which he and the Arachnologists associated with him attached an altogether outstanding importance. He would, he believed, be able to show that their claim that these names should be accorded rights under the Law of Priority was thoroughly well founded. What he was asking for was that these names should be recognised, notwithstanding the fact that they were published in 1757 and were thus anterior to the date prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. It was a matter of indifference to him whether this end were achieved through the addition of a special saving clause to Article 26 or by any other means.

Before submitting the present application, he had consulted the entire body of specialists at present engaged in the study of Arachnology in any part of the world. Of the 62 workers concerned, replies had been received from 54. Of those who had replied, 48 had expressed themselves as in favour of the present petition, while four were opposed and two did not consider themselves sufficiently experienced to justify them in expressing an opinion.

⁹ For the text of Professor Bonnet's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 173—176.

Clerck's work contained the generic name *Araneus* and the oldest names for 54 species of spider; the species concerned were very common and they were to-day habitually known by Clerck's names. What was sought was the grant of official approval for this practice. If this request were now to be rejected, arachnological nomenclature would be plunged into a state of anarchy, for it could not be doubted that the specialists who now used the names published by Clerck would continue to do so, while those who were anxious to use those names but at present did not do so would use different names for the species concerned, though it would be necessary for such authors to cite also the names of Clerck in order to make clear the species to which they were referring. The recognition of the names published for spiders by Clerck would confer a great benefit on the nomenclature of Arachnology and would redound greatly to the credit of the nomenclaturists of 1948.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that he desired to support the proposal submitted by Professor Bonnet. The names published by Clerck were in almost universal use and it would be a grave error to cast the nomenclature of the group into confusion by a rigid adherence to the letter of the *Règles*. There was, in his view, a clear case for the grant of the relief sought by arachnologists.

M. ANDRÉ CHAVAN (FRANCE) said that, while the present application was primarily one of interest to arachnologists, it was of great interest also to malacologists, for there was a book containing names of species of the Phylum Mollusca which was in a position very similar to that of Clerck's *Aranei svecici*. Malacologists were therefore much concerned in the outcome of the present application.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the problem presented by the spider names published by Clerck in 1757 had been the subject of argument since long before the adoption in 1901 of the present *Règles*. The decision taken at that time had given an absolute force to the Law of Priority but it had not been long before it had become apparent that the rigidity so imposed was insupportable and in consequence the Congress had decided at Monaco in 1913 to provide a means by which the Law of Priority could in certain circumstances be relaxed through the use by the Commission of the plenary powers then conferred by the Congress under which the Commission was

authorised to suspend the *Règles* where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise result. It was unfortunate that the present problem had not long ago been submitted to the Commission with a request that it should be dealt with under the plenary powers, for in a case of this sort nothing but added difficulty resulted from delay in seeking a decision from the Commission. Professor Bonnet had referred to the eminent French Arachnologist, M. Simon, who had himself been a member of the Commission from 1915 to 1921. The early records of the Commission had unfortunately been destroyed many years ago but there were indications in the surviving records which suggested that M. Simon had sought in some way to secure that this problem should be brought before the Commission. If such efforts had been made, they had apparently been unsuccessful. The present application was one which would certainly have commanded his enthusiastic support and it was fitting therefore that it should be at a meeting of the Congress held in Paris that this problem should be brought forward for final decision.

If the Section were to decide in principle that the present application should be granted, there would still remain a difficult choice regarding the method to be adopted for that purpose. He (the President) felt that it would be of advantage if further discussion of this application could be deferred to a later meeting in order that in the meanwhile the question of the means to be adopted for giving the relief desired, if such were decided upon by the Section, might be further studied. The case presented unusual features and it was desirable that the Section should be fully seized of all relevant considerations before they came to take a decision on the application submitted. He proposed therefore to hand the papers relating to this case to Professor di Caporiacco so that, when the Commission and the Section next considered this matter, he might be able to give a fuller *exposé* of the issues involved than had been possible at the present meeting. He hoped that this procedure would be agreeable to Professor Bonnet and to the Section as a whole.

(Later reference :
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Minute 4)

THE SECTION agreed to defer until a later meeting the further consideration of the proposal that means should be found to make available under the *Règles* the Arachnid names published in Clerck's *Aranei svecici*, notwithstanding the fact that that work was published prior to 1758, i.e., prior to the date prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature.

Work of the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature in
the period 1935-
1948

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next matter to be considered was the report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on its work during the period of thirteen years which had elapsed since the close of the meeting held in Lisbon in September, 1935. A detailed Report on this subject (Commission Paper (I.C.48)2) had been prepared by the Secretary to the Commission and this, the Commission proposed, should be submitted to the Congress at the same time as the Report on their work during the present Congress which they would themselves be submitting at a later meeting of the Section. The more important of the developments which had occurred between the Lisbon and Paris Congresses would be referred to in that Report, but the Commission felt that, in advance of the circulation of that Report, it would be convenient to the Section to be furnished with an account of the chief developments which had taken place since 1935.

The following is a summary of the statement then made by the President on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

At the close of the Lisbon meeting the Secretaryship to the Commission had fallen vacant through the resignation of that Office by Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) after a distinguished tenure of office which had extended over a period of 38 years. The Commission had asked Dr. Stiles to officiate as Acting Secretary until the election of his successor. This had taken place in October, 1936, when Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) had been elected to be Secretary. In consequence, the Secretariat of the Commission had then been transferred from Washington to London.

At the end of the year 1937 the Class 1937 completed its term of service and the Commission accordingly constituted a new Class (Class 1946), to which they elected the retiring members of the time-expired Class 1937, namely Commissioners Arndt, Calman, Esaki, Hankó, Jaczewski and Stiles.

In the early part of 1939 two additional Offices had been created by the Commission. The first, that of Vice-President, had been filled by the election thereto of Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.), while the second, that of Assistant Secretary, had been accepted by Commissioner James L. Peters (U.S.A.). On the death of Commissioner Stiles Commissioner Peters had been elected to be Vice-President.

It was naturally not possible for much work to be done during the period of about twelve months in which the Secretaryship was vacant but Dr. Stiles was nevertheless

able to arrange for the publication of one instalment of *Opinions*. The considerable task of transferring the Secretariat to its new headquarters, involving as it did the sorting of records, the introduction of a new system of registering and filing documents, the provision of accommodation, and the raising of funds, occupied the greater part of the period from 1936 to 1939, but in spite of these difficulties some progress was made with the consideration of current problems of nomenclature.

A situation of the utmost gravity for the Commission arose on the outbreak of war in Europe in September, 1939. Two measures of importance were then taken to ward against the dangers confronting the Commission. In the first place, arrangements were made to evacuate the vital records of the Commission from London to a place of safety in the country until such time as it was possible to judge of the effect of the expected air attacks on London. Having thus done everything possible to assure the safety of the physical assets of the Commission, it was necessary next to consider what measures were needed to ensure the continued existence of the Commission during the dangerous times lying ahead. The chief dangers to be apprehended were the risk that the Secretary to the Commission might be killed in an air attack and second that, if the war were to be protracted, the losses in personnel likely to be suffered through the lapsing of the Classes into which it was divided, supplemented by the deaths of Commissioners through old age or other causes, might so deplete the strength of the Commission that it would be a matter of great difficulty to restore the Commission to activity after the war was finished. Acting in consultation with the Secretary and after the best legal advice had been obtained, the President accordingly decided to assume for the duration of the war such extraordinary powers as might be necessary to ensure the continued existence of the Commission as a body. For this purpose he had executed an instrument entitled "Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939". Acting under the powers so assumed, the President in due course constituted the Class 1949 to replace the time-expired Class 1940 and later the Class 1952 to replace the Class 1943, appointing to the new Classes the members of the Classes which had completed their term of service. As so constituted, the Class 1949 included Señor Angel Cabrera, Mr. Frederick Chapman, Mr. Francis Hemming, Dr. Karl Jordan, Professor J. Pellegrin and Professor R. Richter, while the Class 1952 included Dr. A. do Amaral, Professor L. di Caporiacco, Professor J. R. Dymond, Dr. James L. Peters, there having

been two vacancies in the former Class 1943. Under the same powers, the President confirmed in their offices those members of the Commission who held offices of the Commission when those offices fell vacant upon the completion of the term of service of the Commissioners by whom they had been held at the outbreak of the war. In assuming these extraordinary powers, the President had stipulated that any action taken thereunder should be reported to the Commission as soon as possible after the close of hostilities and further that the Commission should furnish a report thereon to the Congress at its next meeting in order that the Congress should be fully informed of the action taken and should have an opportunity of expressing their approval of that action in the same way that the Budapest Congress of 1927 gave their approval to certain somewhat similar action taken by the then Secretary to the Commission after the close of the war of 1914-18.

At the close of the year 1946 the Class 1946 completed its term of service and the Commission constituted in its place the Class 1955, electing thereto four of the retiring members of the Class 1946 (namely Commissioners Boschma, Calman, Hankó, Stoll). The future position of two members of the former Class 1946 was reserved for further consideration, in the case of Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan), because of circumstances arising out of the late war, in the case of Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland), because his whereabouts at that time were unknown.

When the Lisbon Congress closed in September, 1935, there were two vacancies in the membership of the Commission, of which one was due to the death of Commissioner Anton Handlirsch (Austria). Between the Lisbon Congress and the outbreak of war in 1939, the Commission had suffered two further losses through the death first of Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) and later of Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.). As was to be expected, other similar losses occurred during the war, though it was not possible to ascertain the total extent of these losses until the war was over. It was then found that five members of the Commission had died since the outbreak of the war, namely Commissioners C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.), Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.), Frederick Chapman (Australia), Walther Arndt (Germany), Jacques Pellegrin (France). The deaths of these old and valued colleagues were a severe loss to the Commission. The death of Commissioner Arndt came as an especial blow, for his death was due not to natural causes but was caused by the action of the Gestapo by whom, during the war, he was arrested and executed for no other reason apparently than his

intellectual integrity and his attachment to the conception of co-operation between men of science, irrespective of nationality.

In addition, the Commission lost three members through resignation in the period which had elapsed since their meeting in Lisbon in 1935. The Commissioners concerned were: Karl Apstein (Germany); Filippo Silvestri (Italy); Candido Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain). Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) had already resigned at the time of the Lisbon Congress.

All the vacancies which occurred in the membership of the Commission between the close of the Lisbon meeting in September, 1939, and the outbreak of war were filled by the election of new Commissioners. In all, six Commissioners were so elected, namely: Senhor Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) *vice* the late Commissioner A. Handlirsch (Austria); Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) *vice* Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) (resigned); Professor Walther Arndt (Germany) *vice* Commissioner Karl Apstein (Germany) (resigned); Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) *vice* Commissioner F. Silvestri (Italy) (resigned); Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) *vice* Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) (deceased); Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) *vice* Commissioner Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain) (resigned). The following additional elections were made either during the war or since the close of hostilities to fill vacancies in the membership of the Commission: Professor James Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.); Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner L. Stejneger (U.S.A.); Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.); Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) *vice* the late Commissioner F. Chapman (Australia); Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) *vice* the late Commissioner W. Arndt (Germany); Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) *vice* the late Professor J. Pellegrin (France); Dr. Paul Rode (France) *vice* the former Commissioner T. Jaczewski (Poland).

The interruption in international communications caused by the war had been so serious that it was felt that it would not be correct to proceed with the rendering of *Opinions* on current problems of nomenclature. This did not mean, however, that no *Opinions* were rendered during that period, for on the outbreak of war in 1939 there were 45 cases on which decisions had been taken by the Commission at Lisbon on which no *Opinion* had been rendered. During the war *Opinions* were rendered and published on all these cases. In addition, certain cases which had been submitted

to the Commission for vote before the outbreak of war and on which therefore every Commissioner had had an opportunity of expressing his views were completed and *Opinions* rendered on them. Altogether 71 *Opinions* had been rendered since the meeting of the Commission held in Lisbon in 1935. These *Opinions* were: (a) *Opinions* 124-133, for the publication of which by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, arrangements had been made by Dr. Stiles during the period in which he was officiating as Acting Secretary to the Commission; (b) *Opinions* 134-181, in which were embodied decisions taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935; (c) *Opinions* 182-194, dealing with matters on which decisions had been reached since the Lisbon meeting. A start had been made also with the re-publication of the older *Opinions* which had long been out of print and of which copies had become unobtainable. *Opinions* 1-16 had been re-published in this way. Explanatory editorial notes had been added drawing attention to certain features of those *Opinions* which had been modified by later decisions of the Commission or the Congress. It was proposed during the present meeting to place proposals before the Section for the integration into the *Règles* of the *Opinions* already rendered by the Commission; the adoption of the proposals of the Commission under this head would make it possible to dispense with editorial notes of this kind when the remaining *Opinions* came to be re-published.

In addition to publishing the *Opinions* described above, the Commission had published during the war twelve resolutions on various important questions affecting nomenclatorial practice which had been adopted at various times by the Commission or the Congress, many of which had been largely overlooked by reason of not having been published except in the somewhat inaccessible volumes of the proceedings of successive meetings of the Congress. The resolutions so published had been grouped in a series to which the title *Declaration* had been given, to distinguish it from the series of *Opinions*.

When in 1939 it had been decided that the Commission should in future itself publish its own publications, it was decided also that the *Opinions* of the Commission should be issued in a succession of volumes of a single work entitled "Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature." Publication started in August, 1939, when the Commission published the first three parts of volume 2 of the above work, of which volume 1 was reserved for the re-publication of the earlier *Opinions* published at different times between 1907 and 1936. Publication of this volume was started in 1943, at which

time the title of the work was extended to include a reference also to the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission. In 1944 it was decided to reserve the remainder of volume 2, of which by that time 26 Parts had been published, for the *Opinions* recording the decisions taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935, and to start publication of volume 3, containing the *Opinions* adopted since the Lisbon meeting, the two volumes to be published concurrently.

It was only to be expected that the profound dislocation resulting from the war should have created serious difficulties for the Commission as for all other international scientific bodies. Every effort had, however, been made by the Secretary to the Commission not only to keep in close touch with all the available members of the Commission but also by the publication of papers containing interim accounts of the current work of the Commission and its Secretariat and by a very extensive correspondence with specialists in all parts of the world with which postal communications with Great Britain were then open to keep zoologists as fully informed as possible of what was in progress and to maintain their interest in the international regulation of zoological nomenclature. The success of these efforts could be judged by the rapid growth in the number of applications submitted to the Commission and in the volume of the scientific correspondence of the Commission during the later years of the war and in the period which had since elapsed. Further, wherever, as in the United States and elsewhere, groups of specialists had established committees for the study of zoological nomenclature in relation to their specialities, the Secretary to the Commission had entered into relations with the committees so formed and had done everything possible to foster co-operation between those committees and the Commission. This policy, which had been formally adopted by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 when they had adopted the resolution which had since been embodied in *Declaration* 10, clearly offered great opportunities for valuable progress on co-operative lines, a considerable number of interesting and valuable contributions having already been made to the work of the Commission by bodies of this sort established in the United States and Great Britain.

Administrative and financial problems were a constant source of anxiety to the Commission, for when the Secretariat of the Commission was transferred to London consequent upon the election of the present Secretary, the Commission had possessed no funds of any kind, its small out-of-pocket expenses having previously been met from

an annual grant made not to the Commission but personally to the previous Secretary by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., the same institution at the same time undertaking the publication of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission. The first task after the transfer of the Secretariat to Europe had therefore been to raise a small preliminary fund with which to finance the initial activities of the Commission in the new phase of existence on which it was entering. Some three hundred pounds (£300) had been raised in this way by donations made to the Commission by the Royal Society of London and other learned societies in London. The funds so received were most valuable as providing the means for making a start with the work of the Commission but they were obviously inadequate to meet the cost even of discharging the obligations in the matter of publications to which the Commission must regard itself as being committed if it was to work off the arrears of work with which it was already confronted. It was in the hope of raising the funds necessary to carry through this limited programme that in 1943 the Secretary to the Commission issued an appeal for a fund of £1,800. The success of this appeal put an end to the immediate anxieties of the Commission and the situation was further greatly improved when the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation made a conditional grant in 1947 up to a maximum of \$10,900 and a similar grant up to a maximum of \$10,600 for the year 1948.

It had to be recognised, however, that the basis on which the Commission was now operating was extremely precarious, for while the grants made by UNESCO covered essential office expenditure and greatly assisted the Commission's publications, the central problem facing the Commission remained entirely untouched. The entire functioning of the Commission depended at present upon the efforts of the the Honorary Secretary who was not only an unpaid part-time officer but was able to give to the service of the Commission only his spare time in the evenings and at week-ends, his days being necessarily devoted to earning his livelihood in an entirely different occupation. The work of the office of the Commission had now grown to dimensions which, if the work were to be discharged promptly and efficiently, called for the employment of a whole-time salaried official, who would have not only to be thoroughly acquainted with the problems of zoological nomenclature but should himself also be a specialist in the systematics of some branch of the Animal Kingdom, for without the knowledge which could only be obtained in this way no such official could properly perform the

duties which would fall to him to discharge. Before such an official could be appointed and could take over the bulk of the duties discharged by the present spare-time honorary Secretary, the Commission would need not only to have funds sufficient to pay the substantial salary which any zoologist possessing the requisite qualifications would have to be given but also to be in possession of an income sufficiently assured to enable it to offer a reasonable degree of security of tenure to any zoologist to whom the post might be offered. At present the Commission's funds were entirely insufficient to cover the cost of the salary of such an official. Even if this difficulty could be overcome, the sources of the income of the Commission were far from assured, the greater part consisting of a grant made from year to year by UNESCO, which in the present state of international affairs could not be regarded as providing the security that was necessary before the Commission could appoint a highly qualified whole-time official. For the time being, the present honorary Secretary was prepared to continue to give his spare time to the work of the Commission, but obviously this arrangement could not be looked upon as permanent. When it came to an end the Commission—and zoologists who looked to the Commission for assistance in their work—would be confronted with the likelihood of the complete breakdown of the machinery of the Commission unless in the meanwhile effective steps had been taken to meet the situation so created. The present Secretary had done everything in his power to bring this serious problem to the attention of leading zoological institutions but it must be admitted that, while most anxious that the work of the Commission should continue without interruption and indeed desirous of seeing it expanded in various directions, not a single one of the great institutions to which this matter had been submitted had as yet taken any effective steps to deal with the problem. In zoological nomenclature, as in private life, people could not expect indefinitely to get something for nothing. False hopes of this kind could only lead to the discontinuance of the services at present being rendered free of cost. The problem was therefore one of the utmost gravity and importance to every zoologist interested in the maintenance of international regulation in the field of zoological nomenclature. This question was thus brought before the present Congress as one which called for immediate and effective action by those zoologists who held the principal posts in the national museums of natural history in different parts of the world, for it was only the zoologists who held such posts who were in a position to concert the necessary action.

Notwithstanding the great difficulties created by the war, a development of outstanding importance was initiated in the year 1943, when it was decided to establish on behalf of the Commission a journal which would be the Official Organ of the Commission. The journal so founded, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, had received a warm welcome and had reached a stage at which its printing costs were covered by the receipts from sales. This result had been achieved only by setting at a high level the price charged for individual parts. This policy had been subject to a certain amount of criticism on the part of zoologists who were accustomed to obtaining other scientific journals at a much lower cost. The zoologists who argued in favour of a reduction in the prices charged had failed however to demonstrate that the loss involved could be made good by increased subscriptions. On the face of it, it was most unlikely that this result would be achieved, for it was notorious that in existing world conditions the demand for scientific publications was extremely inelastic. Nevertheless, it was clearly desirable on general grounds that the publications of the Commission should be sold at the lowest practicable prices and thus made available to the widest possible circle of zoologists. As an experiment, therefore, a portion of the grant from UNESCO earmarked for publications would be used for reducing the price charged for the Commission's publications. This experiment would be continued so long as the necessary funds were provided by UNESCO, but should those funds cease to be available the policy would have to be reconsidered if in the meantime sales had not increased sufficiently to cover production costs.

Two other plans of importance were launched in the year 1943, the first being that for the publication of the substantive French text of the *Règles*, which had long been out of print, with an accurate translation into English, which did not at that time exist, the English translation in common use being imperfect in many ways, being both incomplete in certain respects and containing also serious errors of translation. Considerable progress had been achieved in the preparation of this edition and a large number of zoological institutions and individual zoologists had enrolled themselves as prospective subscribers. A grant towards the cost of printing had been received from the Royal Society of London. The project had, however, been put on one side until after the present Congress, it being considered that zoologists would prefer to see publication postponed until after the present Congress so that the new edition might take account of any amendments to the *Règles* that might be adopted at Paris.

The second of the two projects started in 1943 was the publication, in book form, of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," which had become virtually useless as an instrument for the stabilisation of generic nomenclature through not being accessible in the form of a single volume. The task of preparing this work for publication had been extremely arduous, the Secretary having found it necessary to verify every bibliographical reference given in the *Opinions*, by means of which names had been placed on the "Official List," many of which were found to be incorrect, and also to ascertain the original place of publication of the large number of names placed on, or otherwise cited in, the "Official List," for which no bibliographical references had been given in the *Opinions* concerned. The greater part of this task had, however, now been completed and a substantial portion of the "Official List" was already in the hands of the printer. A grant towards the cost of printing had been made in this case also by the Royal Society of London, and a large number of zoological institutions and individual zoologists had enrolled themselves as prospective subscribers.

The multifarious developments in the work of the Commission since the outbreak of war in 1939 had made it necessary to give careful consideration to the financial structure to be adopted for the ordering of the affairs of the Commission. From the moment in 1938 when the Commission first became possessed of any funds at all, a firm of professional Chartered Accountants had been employed to audit the accounts every year and the accounts so audited had been published in the Commission's *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, together with an explanatory report. The fact however that the Commission, being an unincorporated body, possessed no juridical personality of its own and could not enter into any form of contract became increasingly unsatisfactory, as the scale of the activities of the Commission gathered momentum, for the absence of an incorporated status for the Commission had meant that it had been necessary for the Secretary to the Commission personally to assume financial responsibility for all actions taken in the name of the Commission. The situation so created clearly could not be allowed to continue, and accordingly, after consultation with all the members of the Commission, steps were taken by the Secretary to form a corporation under United Kingdom law which would assume full responsibility for the management of the funds of the Commission. It was not found possible actually to incorporate the Commission, for, owing to its international character, there were not a sufficient number of members of the Commission available to attend business meetings of the Corporation. In order to get over this difficulty it was

agreed that the corporation should include among its members the minimum number of persons normally resident in the United Kingdom necessary to ensure a quorum at meetings in addition to all the members of the Commission. The Articles of Association of the corporation were so drafted as to ensure that the Trust, when dealing with funds contributed for the purposes of the Commission, should be empowered only to expend those funds on purposes approved by the Commission, which was therefore assured of full control over the expenditure of those funds. The corporation so constituted was formally brought into existence at the beginning of 1947 with the title "International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature." The chairmanship of the Trust was accepted by the Right Hon. Walter Elliot, a former British Cabinet Minister. The Secretary to the Commission was Managing Director and Secretary of the Trust.

Ever since the end of the war it had been evident that the present Congress would be of outstanding importance, and that if any early reforms were to be made in zoological nomenclature they must be made on that occasion, for it was the Congress alone which possessed authority to modify the *Règles*. Particular efforts had therefore been made by the Secretary to the Commission to ascertain, by correspondence and personal discussion, the general wishes of zoologists regarding the directions in which the *Règles* could be improved and clarified, the membership of the Commission placed on a more genuinely international and representative basis and its procedure so reformed as to enable it to function in an efficient and businesslike manner. This preparatory work had been greatly assisted by a visit paid by the Secretary to the United States and Canada at Christmas, 1947. This visit had been undertaken at the invitation of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, which had made a grant also towards the travelling expenses so incurred. This visit had been of exceptional value and interest, for it had made it possible for the Secretary to hold a conference with the United States members of the Commission as well as to hold extensive and comprehensive discussions with the specialists at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, the American Museum of Natural History, New York, and the Chicago Museum of Natural History and with the large gathering of zoologists attending the annual meeting at Chicago of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the equally representative gathering of palaeontologists attending the annual meeting at Ottawa of the Paleontological Society of America held during the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America. By means of these discussions it had been

possible both to ascertain the directions in which, in the view of the American workers concerned, further progress was desirable, and also to place before those specialists particulars of the subjects proposed to be raised at the Paris Congress. Nothing could have been of greater value to the Commission than these discussions, for they placed it in possession of the views of American workers in a way which would otherwise have been quite impossible of achievement, a consideration which was of especial importance in view of the fact that the Congress was to meet in the following year and that its place of meeting was to be in Europe.

THE PRESIDENT added that, while the account which he had given of the work of the Commission and of its Secretariat during the 13 years which had elapsed since the last meeting of the Congress covered all the main points of importance, the Report prepared by the Secretary to the Commission dealt with these questions much more fully and would be found to contain information on a large number of other matters of interest. The report which he had just made contained no proposals for action. It was proposed, however, as the next item on the agenda, to present a short oral report from the Commission, in which would be included a number of specific proposals which the Commission desired to bring before the Section and for which they sought the approval of the Section and, through the Section, the approval of the Congress.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the work of the Commission and its Secretariat during the period of 13 years between the close in 1935 of the meeting of the Congress held in Lisbon and the opening of the present Congress and agreed that the detailed Report on these matters prepared by the Secretary to the Commission should be presented to the Congress at the same time as the Report to be prepared by the Commission on the work carried out during the present meeting of the Congress.

**Report by the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature on
action taken at
its present (Paris)
Session in regard
to matters of
personnel and
recommendations
on such matters
submitted to the
Congress for
approval**

8. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, now that the Section had been furnished with a full report on all matters of importance which had arisen in connection with the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period between the close of the Lisbon Congress in September, 1935, and the opening of the present Congress in July, 1948, he proposed to lay before the Section a report on the action taken by the Commission during its present Session in regard to various matters affecting its personnel and allied questions and at the same time to submit various recommendations in

regard to questions arising in this field, for which the Commission sought the approval of the Section and, through the Section, the approval of the Congress.

The Section would recall that at previous meetings of the Congress the International Commission had devoted a portion of their Report to a description of the changes in the personnel of the Commission which had occurred since the last meeting of the Congress and had included in the same portion of their Report such recommendations in regard to matters of this kind as they desired to submit for approval, first by the Section and second by the Congress in *Concilium Plenum*. On this occasion also the Commission proposed to deal with these matters in the Report which they would lay before the Section at a later meeting, but they felt that, in view of the fact that it had happily been possible to arrange for a substantially larger number of meetings of the Section than had been customary on previous occasions, it would be both more courteous to the Section and more suited to the general convenience if on the present occasion they were to submit to the Section the recommendations for which they desired the approval of the Section and the Congress before they drafted the portion of their Report dealing with this subject. Their task in preparing that document would clearly be greatly simplified if they knew in advance that their recommendations in this field had already received the approval of the Section. For the Section, also, the Commission believed that the procedure now adopted would prove agreeable, affording, as it did, the maximum opportunity for discussion on any proposal on which such discussion might be desired.

The first matter which it was the duty of the Commission to report to the Section was that to their great regret they had received a notification from their old friend and highly esteemed colleague Commissioner Karl Jordan of his desire to be relieved of the burden of the presidency of the Commission on account of advancing years and the misfortune of almost total deafness. Dr. Jordan had been a member of the Commission continuously for a period of 35 years, having been first elected a Commissioner at the meeting of the Congress held at Monaco in 1913. Of that period he had been the President of the Commission for 19 years, having been elected to that Office in 1929 following the death of his eminent Italian predecessor, the late Professor F. S. Monticelli. First as an individual member of the Commission and later as its President, Dr. Jordan had brought to the service of the Commission a wealth of knowledge and a wisdom of counsel which had been of the greatest value. On succeeding to the presidency

he had added to these a high sense of judicial impartiality which had been of the utmost service to the Commission and had greatly contributed to its prestige and authority. The Section would be glad to learn that, although Dr. Jordan would no longer be the President of the Commission, he had consented to remain one of its members. The Commission hoped therefore that for many years to come they would have the benefit of Dr. Jordan's ripe knowledge and experience. The Section felt that it would be the wish of the Congress to confer upon Dr. Jordan some signal mark of the high appreciation in which they held him, and they accordingly desired to suggest that the Congress should create, on an *ad hoc* basis, an Office of Honorary Life President and should offer that Office to Dr. Jordan as a mark of their esteem and respect.

To fill the presidency left vacant by the retirement of Dr. Jordan, the Commission recommended the election thereto of Dr. James Lee Peters (U.S.A.), who had been a member of the Commission since 1933 and Vice-President since 1947. The Commission felt confident that the impartiality and dignity of this high Office would be in safe keeping in Dr. Peters' hands and they warmly commended to the Section and to the Congress their proposal that he should be elected to be their new President.

The Commission had nominated Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) to be Vice-President in the place of Commissioner James L. Peters, on the election of the latter to be President. The Commission commended this nomination to the favourable consideration of the Congress.

The Commission had decided to abolish the Office of Assistant Secretary, as at present constituted, and to make the title of "Assistant Secretary" available for an honorary (spare-time) personal assistant to the honorary (spare-time) Secretary.

The Commission had next to report that, owing to the absence of President Jordan for the reasons which had already been explained and of Vice-President Peters which was due to various reasons outside his control, the only Officer of the Commission in attendance at the present Session was their Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming, to whom, therefore, had fallen the duty of officiating as Acting President of the Commission during the present Congress.

The high cost of travel, the difficulties arising from the exchange control imposed by many countries and other disturbing factors resulting from the recent world war, had made it impossible for a number of the members of the Commission to attend the present Congress. Of the total

membership, the following five were in attendance: Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands); Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.); Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy); Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom); M. Paul Rode (France). Up to the last moment Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) had fully intended to be present but almost on the eve of his departure from Copenhagen for Paris he had been ordered by his medical advisers to abandon the journey. Dr. Mortensen had been a member of the Congress for many years and was held in the highest esteem not only by his colleagues on the Commission but also by his many friends in the general body of the Congress. The Commission had sent Dr. Mortensen a telegram expressing their great regret at his absence and the reasons which had made it unavoidable, and they felt sure that the Section and the Congress would wish to associate themselves in this message of sympathy and affection.

In accordance with the procedure approved by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology held at Budapest in 1927 and confirmed by the subsequent meetings of the Congress, the Commission had taken steps to invite certain eminent and representative zoologists of various nationalities to act as Alternate Members of the Commission during its present Session in the place of Commissioners who for one reason or another were unable to be present. The members of the Congress so appointed to be Alternate Members of the Commission were:—Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico) *vice* Commissioner Angel Cabrera (Argentina); Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom) *vice* President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom); Professor Arthur Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) *vice* Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil); Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.); Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) *vice* Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.); Mr. Norman D. Riley (United Kingdom) *vice* Commissioner W. T. Calman (United Kingdom); Professor R. Späreck (Denmark) *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark); Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) *vice* Commissioner R. Richter (Germany); Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.). No Alternate Members had as yet been appointed in the place of the following Commissioners who were unable to attend the present Congress:—Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada); Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary); Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia).

The Commission considered it a matter of the utmost importance that every possible measure should be taken to maintain and strengthen the bonds between the Commission on the one hand and the general body of zoologists

on the other. In particular, the Commission attached the greatest significance to the establishment of close and harmonious relations between itself and the members of the Congress on those occasions when the Commission and the Congress were meeting concurrently. Inspired by these motives, the Commission had decided at their first meeting that all their meetings during the present Congress should be held in public and thus thrown open to every member of the Congress. This decision, which had been posted on the Notice Board of the Congress, had received a warm welcome from the members of the Congress. It had given the Commission the opportunity of bringing into close personal consultation leading zoologists present at the Congress and it had enabled those zoologists actively to participate in the work of the Commission and thus become better acquainted both with the problems involved and with the spirit in which the Commission approached its task.

The Commission had next the sad duty to report the death since the last meeting of the Congress of seven of their members. Of these six had died from old age or other natural causes, while one was brutally murdered during the war by the Gestapo in Berlin. The Commissioners concerned were: Dr. H. B. Fantham (Canada); Dr. Witmer Stone (U.S.A.); Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.); Dr. Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.); Mr. Frederick Chapman (Australia); Dr. Walther Arndt (Germany); Professor Jacques Pellegrin (France). The Commission felt sure that the Section would wish to mark their respect for their colleagues who had died during the period 1935-1948 by rising in their places and standing in silence for two minutes.

(The members of the Section on Nomenclature then rose in their places and stood for two minutes in silence to mark their respect for the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who had died during the period 1935-1948.)

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT said that the Commission felt certain that the Section on Nomenclature and the entire Congress would wish emphatically to condemn the abominable crime which had robbed them of their colleague Dr. Walther Arndt, who, the mildest and most inoffensive of men and one who had devoted his whole life and much of his fortune to the advancement of science, had been hurriedly arrested in Berlin during the war and had suffered death by the headman's axe. This disgraceful murder, which was apparently due to no other reason than Dr. Arndt's intellectual integrity and to his attachment to

the conception of co-operation between men of science irrespective of nationality, was an ineffaceable outrage on the whole body of men of science. The Commission proposed therefore to refer especially to this matter in the Report which they would later submit to the Section.

In the report by the Secretary to the Commission on the work of that body during the period 1935-1948 which had already been presented, the Section had been informed of the elections made by the Commission during that period to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation, or by the expiry of the term of service of Classes in the membership of the Commission. The Commission asked the Section and the Congress to approve and confirm the election of the Commissioners concerned.

The Section had also been furnished by the Secretary with particulars of the extraordinary powers assumed by the President on the outbreak of war in 1939 for the purpose of assuring the continued existence of the Commission in the dangerous period into which it was then entering, and of the action taken by the President under those powers. The Commission were certain that the Section would wish to commend the vigorous and effective action taken by the President in this matter and would give it their retrospective approval.

The Commission had also to report that they had lost touch with one of their members, Professor T. Jaczewski (Poland), who, through the circumstances of the recent war, had become a Displaced Person. In the circumstances, the Commission had thought it right to treat Professor Jaczewski's place on the Commission as having become vacant in like manner as though he had died or had resigned. The Commission sought the approval of the Section both for the action so taken and also for the adoption of permanent regulations authorising the adoption of similar action if a comparable situation were ever to recur.

The Class 1949 of the membership of the Commission would complete its term of service at the end of the present Congress. The Commission had nominated the following retiring Commissioners to serve for a further term as Commissioners: Cabrera (Argentina); Hemming (United Kingdom); Jordan (United Kingdom); Pearson (Australia). The Commission recommended that in the future, as in the past, one-third of the total membership of the Commission should vacate their position at the end of each meeting of the Congress, the members so retiring being eligible, however, for immediate re-election, but that the system of 9-year Classes should be discontinued as, in view of the irregularity with which meetings of the Congress were held,

this system had outlived its usefulness. In its place the Commission proposed that the names of the members of the Commission should be arranged in the order in which they had been elected or, most recently, been re-elected members, and that at the close of each meeting of the Congress the third part of the Commission comprising the members of the Commission with the longest service since election, or latest re-election, should complete its term of service.

The Commission had also to report that they had nominated Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) to be a member of the Commission, and that he had consented to serve as such. The Commission asked for confirmation of this election.

Each Officer of the Commission vacated his appointment on completion of his term of service as a Commissioner but was eligible for immediate reappointment on being re-elected a member of the Commission. In consequence of this rule, the Secretaryship of the Commission would fall vacant at the end of the present Congress. The Commission had nominated Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) for a further term of Office as Secretary and they commended this nomination to the favourable consideration of the Congress.

A difficult situation had arisen in regard to the position of two of the zoologists who, at the outbreak of war, had been members of the Commission. The Commissioners concerned were: Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany) and Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan). The study of zoology was, or should be, entirely divorced from political considerations, but, in view of the circumstances existing in Germany and Japan respectively immediately before the outbreak of the recent war, the nature of which was well known to all members of the Congress, the Commission, after the most careful consideration, had come to the conclusion that it was desirable to afford to the zoologists of Germany and Japan respectively a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes as to the zoologists by whom they desired respectively to be represented on the Commission. Pending the completion of this consultation, the Commission did not propose to recommend the re-election of these two Commissioners. The Commission asked the Congress to endorse this recommendation. The Commission, in putting forward the foregoing recommendations, wished to make it clear that the conclusion which they had reached in this matter had been taken on grounds of principle and was not intended to reflect, and did not, in fact, reflect, either upon the professional eminence of Professor Richter or Professor Esaki or upon the value of the services rendered to the

Commission by those zoologists while serving as Commissioners.

Since the last meeting of the Congress the Commission had actively pursued the policy set forth in their *Declaration* 10 of encouraging in every way the establishment of groups of specialists to study problems of zoological nomenclature affecting their own groups. Wherever such groups had been established, the closest possible relations had been established with the Commission through action initiated on their behalf by their Secretary. The Commission looked forward to the time when each of the principal groups of the Animal Kingdom would be covered by a group of this kind and when also the national museums of natural history in each of the principal countries would possess a committee on nomenclature, through which the Commission could obtain an indication of the feeling of zoologists in that institution on current problems as they arose.

A proposal was then moved and seconded that the recommendations submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the personnel of the Commission and matters connected therewith be approved by the Section and submitted to the International Congress of Zoology for approval in *Concilium Plenum*. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section to move an amendment to this proposal, and no member had signified his desire to bring forward such an amendment, THE PRESIDENT then put the foregoing proposal to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Despatch of a telegram to Dr. Karl Jordan offering the office of Honorary Life President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

9. THE PRESIDENT said that now that the Section had approved the proposal of the Commission that a special Office of Honorary Life President of the Commission be created and that this Office be offered to Dr. Karl Jordan on the occasion of his resignation of the Office of President of the Commission, it would, he felt sure, be the wish of the Section that he should address a telegram to Dr. Jordan informing him of the action taken by the Section to mark the affection and esteem in which they held him.

THE SECTION invited the President to telegraph to Dr. Jordan in this sense.

Thanks to UNESCO for financial assistance granted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

10. THE SECTION agreed to place on record their warm appreciation of the interest in, and the understanding of the needs of, the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature shown by UNESCO and their grateful thanks for the munificent subvention made to the funds of the Commission by UNESCO in the year 1947 and for the continuation of that support in the year 1948.

Thanks to donors
of contributions to
the funds of the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

11. THE SECTION agreed to place on record their thanks to all Government Agencies, Museums and other Scientific Institutions, Learned Societies and individual zoologists and palaeontologists in all parts of the world who, during the period 1938-1948, had assisted the work of the Commission by making donations to its funds.

Communication
addressed to the
Congress on
behalf of the
Austrian
zoologists

12. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that since his arrival in Paris he had received a communication signed jointly by Professor Otto Storch, President of the Zoological Institute of Vienna, Dr. Karl Holdhaus, Director of the Natural History Museum, and Dr. U. Stundral, Secretary-General of the Zoologisch-Botanische Gesellschaft of Vienna, on behalf of the zoologists of Austria. In this communication the Austrian zoologists had expressed the view that a fundamental reform in the *Règles* was required in order to secure that well-known names should not be upset through the operation of the Law of Priority. That such changes should be avoided should, the Austrian zoologists considered, be regarded as a fundamental principle which should be constantly borne in mind. Any changes that might be made in the *Règles* should be founded upon this principle. The Austrian zoologists greatly regretted that circumstances prevented them from attending the present Congress. They asked that no changes involving the reform which they sought should be made in the *Règles* until a later meeting at which they could be present and would prefer that no changes of any kind should be made until such a meeting could be held.

THE PRESIDENT said that all zoologists regretted that, through circumstances arising out of the late war, it was not possible for zoologists of every country to be represented at the present Congress. It was not possible however on this account to put a complete stop upon all progress in the reform of the *Règles*. It was very evident from the attitude of the zoologists attending the present Congress and also from that of many who were unable to be present that zoologists generally would regard both the Commission and the Congress as deserving of blame if at the present Congress they were to fail to make an effort to remove the more obvious of the blemishes in the present *Règles* and to fill in the more obvious of the gaps which marred those *Règles*. The actual proposal which was particularly advocated by the Austrian zoologists, namely, the placing of limitations upon the Law of Priority in the interests of stability in nomenclature, was a matter which was uppermost in the minds of many zoologists in all parts

of the world. The Section had just had a most interesting and illuminating discussion on this very subject on proposals put forward by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) and by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France). Many members of the Section would evidently have liked to see an immediate decision taken on those proposals, but the Section had recognised that, while many zoologists attached the greatest importance to the early recognition of a Law of Prescription imposed for the sake of preserving names in common use, there were others who were not at the present Congress who did not share this view. The Section had therefore—very wisely, as he thought—decided to defer taking a decision on this matter until the next Congress when every group of zoologists would have had a further opportunity of considering the question not as a theoretical but as a practical issue. In the meanwhile the Commission were to undertake a thorough study of the whole problem on the basis of a comprehensive consultation with specialists in all countries. On this issue, which the Austrian zoologists considered to be the most important now awaiting decision, the action which the Section had taken would be completely agreeable to the zoologists of Austria. If the Section approved, he (the President) proposed to write to Professor Storch in the foregoing sense. The communication submitted to the Congress by Professor Storch and his colleagues would be attached to the record of the present discussion, together with the text of whatever reply was sent thereto.

THE SECTION took note of the communication addressed to the Congress by Professor Storch and other Viennese zoologists on behalf of the zoologists of Austria, approved the statement of policy made by the President and invited him to reply to Professor Storch in the terms which he had proposed.

(For the text of the communication received from Professor Storch and other Viennese zoologists on behalf of the zoologists of Austria and of the President's reply thereto, see Appendix¹⁰.)

**Amendment of the
"Règles": proposals
submitted by the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature**

13. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he proposed now to invite the Section to turn to what was both the most important and the most responsible of the duties committed to them by the Congress, namely, the examination of proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the amendment of the *Règles*. At former meetings of the Congress the opportunity afforded to the Section for the discussion of such proposals had been very limited, for the fact that the Section had usually held only one meeting during each

¹⁰ See pp. 77—78.

Congress had made it inevitable that the first intimation to the Section of a desire by the Commission to secure a change in the *Règles* was on the presentation by the Commission of the Report which they had prepared for submission to the Congress. It would therefore have been difficult for the Section effectively to dissent from the proposals of the Commission without at the same time rejecting the Report prepared by the Commission. On the present occasion the Commission had charged him on their behalf to submit to the Section an oral statement setting out the recommendations for which they sought the approval of the Section in advance of the preparation of their Report to the Congress. If on any of the questions involved the Section were to take a view different from that recommended, the Commission would consider the matter further before finally deciding upon the terms of their Report to the Congress. The Commission were hopeful however that it would be found that the recommendations now to be submitted would meet with the approval of the Section, for each of those recommendations had been agreed upon by the Commission at a public meeting at which any member of the Congress had been free to be present and which had in fact been attended by the majority of those present at today's meeting of the Section. The fact that every one of the recommendations now submitted had been unanimously adopted and had secured also the approval of the other members of the Congress who attended the meetings concerned was evidence of the wide support which those recommendations commanded.

In a complicated matter such as the consideration of a large number of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* to which the Section had now to address itself, it was essential that there should be no room for doubt as to the exact scope of the changes proposed. It was for this reason that a distribution had been made of the documents which had been before the Commission at the time when the proposals in question were under consideration. Additional copies of these documents were available for any member of the Section who wished to have a copy for his or her personal use.

The programme for the reform of the " Règles " advocated by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The general programme of reform which the Commission hoped to see carried through by the present Congress was outlined in Commission Paper I.C.(48)1, and that part of it which was concerned with the amendment of the *Règles* was described in greater detail in Commission Paper I.C.(48)6. As would be seen from those papers, the Commission hoped that the Congress would agree (1) to incorporate, subject to certain exceptions and modifications, the

The recommendations of the Commission regarding the method to be adopted to give effect to the decisions of the Congress for the reform of the " Règles "

(For a later decision modifying this proposal, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Minute 9)

interpretations of the *Règles* given at various times in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission by the insertion in the *Règles* of express provisions dealing with the problems involved; (2) to make such changes in the *Règles* as were necessary either to remove ambiguities or to bring the *Règles* into line with the general wishes of zoologists; (3) to insert provisions embodying the substance of a number of important resolutions adopted by the Congress at various times (and since embodied by the Commission in *Declarations*); (4) to deal with various matters on which the *Règles* were at present silent; (5) to substitute *Recommandations* for mandatory provisions in certain cases; (6) to remove inconsistencies of phraseology which at present marred the *Règles* in various ways. The Commission were of the opinion—which they were confident would be shared by the Section—that the proper course for the Congress would be to concentrate upon taking clear-cut and unambiguous decisions on the questions at issue without attempting to draft the actual provisions which, in order to give effect to their decisions, would need to be inserted in the substantive French text of the *Règles*. Quite apart from the language problem inherent in drafting provisions in one language (French) on the basis of decisions taken in a different language (English), the task of drafting provisions of this sort involved a technical skill and experience inevitably lacked by zoologists. The Commission recommended therefore that this task should be deferred until after the close of the Congress when it should be entrusted to expert jurists. The jurists should be asked also to fill in certain gaps in the substantive French text where at present there was only an English text, and also to prepare a literal English translation of the *Règles* as revised. It was proposed that, when the jurists had prepared a draft French text to give effect to the decisions reached by the Congress, the text so prepared, together with the English translation, should be subject to a close scrutiny to ensure that the wording employed was appropriate from the zoological point of view and to make certain that the text proposed gave effect to the whole of the decisions reached by the Congress but contained no other provisions varying the meaning of the existing *Règles*. The Commission recommended that the duty of undertaking this scrutiny should be entrusted to the Executive Committee of the Commission. Finally it was proposed that, when this scrutiny had been completed and any necessary consequential changes made in the text, the Secretary to the Commission should arrange with the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the Corporation which, as the Section would recall, was now responsible for the manage-

ment of the business affairs of the Commission) for the publication of the revised *Règles* at the earliest possible moment and that those *Règles* should enter into effect immediately upon being so promulgated. The price to be charged for the revised edition of the *Règles* would be set at the lowest possible level.

The papers relating to the proposed amendment of the *Règles* which had so far been studied by the Commission in conjunction with the members of the Congress who had attended the meetings concerned were Papers I.C.(48)1 and 5 to 14. Of these, Paper I.C.(48)5, which was concerned with the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the *Règles*, had already been considered by the Section, by whom the recommendations there submitted had been approved. As regards Papers I.C.(48)1 and 6, he (the President) had just put before the Section the recommendations of a general character there submitted. He accordingly now proposed to report to the Section the recommendations submitted by the Commission on the basis of their consideration of the remaining Papers (Papers I.C.(48)7 to 14), together with certain recommendations on particular points which had been adopted by the Commission in the course of their consideration of Paper I.C.(48)6. The recommendations so submitted fell into five groups, with each of which he would deal separately.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
1st Meeting,
Minute 6)

Meaning of the
expression
"indication" as
used in relation to
generic names in
Article 25

(a) The first subject to be considered was the recommendation of the Commission in regard to the meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Article 25 of the *Règles*. This problem was discussed in detail in Paper I.C.(48)7. Over 40 years ago (in *Opinion* 1) the Commission had given a ruling that a generic name published without explanatory matter, without a designated or indicated type but containing two or more previously published nominal species, was not to be regarded as having been published with an "indication". This ruling had been almost completely overlooked and it was evident from a comprehensive inquiry undertaken by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature in Paleontology in America, the results of which had been submitted to the Commission, that an insistence on the interpretation of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 1 would clearly run counter to the wishes of the great majority of workers and that, if this provision were now to be applied, it would lead to widespread confusion in nomenclature through the pointless changes to which such a course would lead. The Commission accordingly proposed that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that a generic name published

prior to 1st January, 1931, in the circumstances described above should be accepted as having been published with an "indication". At the same time the Commission proposed to cancel the relevant portion of *Opinion* 1.

Proposed establishment of rules for the naming of infra-specific forms.

(b) The second subject on which the Commission desired to submit proposals to the Congress was the nomenclature of categories of less than specific rank. Already as far back as 1932 the International Congress of Entomology had submitted a recommendation on this subject to the Congress. Unfortunately, the Commission had not been able in the three ensuing years to consider this question with sufficient care to enable them at their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 to submit recommendations to the Congress for the clarification of the *Règles* in this matter. On that occasion the Commission had however requested their Secretary to consult with specialists with a view to the submission by him of a Report, with proposals for the issue by the Commission of an *Opinion* setting out the law in this matter. In accordance with this request, the Secretary had submitted the Report which had been distributed as Paper I.C.(48)9. It was to be regretted that sixteen years should have elapsed before the submission to the Congress of concrete proposals on this subject, but it was satisfactory to be able to note that the present scheme had been unanimously adopted by the Commission and had secured also the approval of the other members of the Congress who had attended the meetings of the Commission at which this subject had been discussed. As regards the form of the action now proposed to be taken, it would be recalled that during the present Session the Commission had made it clear that they were opposed to the growth of a body of case law outside the *Règles*. The Commission proposed therefore that this matter should be dealt with by way of the insertion of substantive provisions in the *Règles* and not, as they had contemplated at Lisbon in 1935, by way of an *Opinion*.

The Report submitted (Paper I.C.(48)9) contained an account of the history of this problem, a description of the attitude taken by different groups of zoologists and an analysis of the problems involved, together with proposals for their solution. While it was true that it was not until 1932 that this question had been brought expressly to the attention of the Commission, it was a matter both for surprise and for regret that it had not been raised at a much earlier date, for the difficulty involved was due to an inherent defect in the *Règles* as adopted at Berlin nearly fifty years ago. This difficulty arose from the fact that the *Règles* recognised only one taxonomic category below the species level, while zoologists recognised many

such categories ranging from subspecies based upon variations characteristic of whole populations through minority elements of many kinds down to individual aberrations. Some zoologists interpreted the expression "subspecies" as used in the *Règles* in the normal sense of a population within a given species differentiated by certain characters from other subspecies of that species. Such zoologists regarded other infra-specific forms as falling outside the scope of the *Règles*. Other zoologists regarded the expression "subspecies" as covering for this purpose all categories below the species level. Hence, wide divergencies of practice had arisen and no uniformity could be achieved until the *Règles* themselves were amended so as to recognise two different classes of infra-specific form: (a) the subspecies in the conventional taxonomic sense of a population, and (b) all other subspecific forms, i.e. all infra-subspecific forms.

The question which the Commission had had to consider was the status to be given to names published for units of the infra-subspecific class. Here a certain divergence of interest existed, a divergence dependent on the scope of the work of the zoologists concerned. In the first place there were all those zoologists who were concerned with the study of categories down to, and including, the subspecies level but no further. For these zoologists the unqualified grant of rights under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy to names given to minority elements as contrasted with whole populations would constitute a severe handicap, for it would make it necessary for these workers to burden themselves with recording the many thousands of names published for minority elements, for this would be unavoidable if within any given genus such a name might render a name given to a new species or subspecies invalid by reason of its being a homonym of a name previously published for a minority element of some species belonging to the same genus. Such workers were therefore opposed to the unrestricted grant of nomenclatorial status to names published for forms below the subspecies level. On the other hand, there were those zoologists who were interested in the study of infra-subspecific forms, whose work would be gravely embarrassed if there were no provisions in the *Règles* which would ensure that every such form should always be known by the same name (Law of Priority) and that no name should be employed for more than one form within the same genus (Law of Homonymy). Finally, there was a third group which included many workers in the applied fields (e.g. economic entomologists), who demanded that means should be found, through appropriate modifications of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy,

to secure that parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species should bear the same name.

The scheme now submitted proposed that these different needs should be met by the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions under which the Laws of Priority and Homonymy should apply both to the names of species and subspecies and also to the names of infra-subspecific forms, but that these Laws should operate independently for each of these two groups. Under this system those zoologists whose work was not concerned with forms below the subspecies level would not need to take any account of names published for infra-subspecific forms, while the needs of those zoologists who on the contrary were interested to secure that names given to forms of this kind should be protected under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy would be met in full. It was an essential part of this scheme that the *Règles* should contain provisions defining for nomenclatorial purposes (1) a name given to a "subspecies" and (2) a name given to an "infra-subspecific form" and that an objective test should be provided to enable zoologists to determine to which of these categories any given name belonged. The test proposed was the evidence provided by the description or other data given in the publication in which the name in question first appeared. In order to ensure the maximum degree of stability for current practice, it was proposed that, in the case of names published prior to the introduction of the scheme (which it was proposed should be as from 1st January, 1951), a less rigorous standard should be applied for determining whether a given name had been proposed for a "subspecies" rather than for an "infra-subspecific form" but that a more rigorous standard should be required in the case of names published after that date. The scheme also contained provisions which would enable a name originally published as the name of a "species" or "subspecies" to take rank as the name of an "infra-subspecific" form when on taxonomic grounds it was considered necessary to treat the form so named as being an "infra-subspecific" form, and which enabled a name originally published as the name of an "infra-subspecific" form to be promoted to be the name of a subspecies (or species) when such promotion was judged to be necessary on taxonomic grounds. In the latter case it was essential that for the purposes of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy the name should rank as the name of a "subspecies" only as from the date on which it was elevated to that category, for otherwise it would still be necessary for workers interested only in the study of categories down to and including the subspecies level to keep a complete record of all names published for "infra-subspecific" forms. It was

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July, 1948*. Parts 1-21 have already been published and the remaining Parts, containing the subject index, are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume has been devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948*, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature. Parts 1-6 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.